1	TN MUTE INTERED COMMES DISCOULTED COLLEGE
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
2	NORTHERN DIVISION
3	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL. PLAINTIFFS
5	VERSUS CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:12-CV-790-HTW-LGI
6	THE CITY OF JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI, ET AL. DEFENDANTS
7	
8	STATUS CONFERENCE
9	BEFORE THE HONORABLE HENRY T. WINGATE, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE,
10	OCTOBER 10, 2024 JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI
11	UACKSUN, MISSISSIFFI
12	
13	
14	
15	(APPEARANCES NOTED HEREIN.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	REPORTED BY:
23	CAROLINE MORGAN, CCR #1957 OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
24	501 E. Court Street, Suite 2.500 Jackson, Mississippi 39201
25	Telephone: (601)608-4188 E-mail: Caroline Morgan@mssd.uscourts.gov

```
1
     FOR THE PLAINTIFF, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:
 2
             KARL J. FINGERHOOD, ESQUIRE
             U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
 3
             ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT SECTION
             POST OFFICE BOX 7611
 4
             WASHINGTON, DC 20044
 5
             ANGELA GIVENS WILLIAMS, ESQUIRE
             MITZI DEASE PAIGE, ESOUIRE
 6
             U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
             501 EAST COURT STREET, STE. 4.430
 7
             JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39201
    FOR THE PLAINTIFF, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI:
 8
 9
             ROY FURRH, ESQUIRE
             DAVID L. CAMPBELL, ESQUIRE
10
             MS DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
             515 EAST AMITE STREET
11
             JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39201
12
     FOR THE DEFENDANT, CITY OF JACKSON:
13
             TERRELL S. WILLIAMSON, ESQUIRE
14
             DREW MARTIN, ESQUIRE
             SHERIDAN CARR, ESQUIRE
15
             OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
             455 EAST CAPITOL STREET
16
             JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39201
17
    FOR THE DEFENDANT, JXN WATER:
18
             CHARLES MITCHELL MCGUFFEY, ESQUIRE
             MALISSA WILSON, ESQUIRE
19
             FORMAN, WATKINS & KRUTZ, LLP
             POST OFFICE BOX 22608
20
             JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39225-2608
2.1
             FRANK PAUL CALAMITA, ESQUIRE
            AQUALAW, PLC
22
             6 S.5TH STREET
             RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219
23
24
25
```

```
1
     FOR THE INTERVENOR PLAINTIFF:
 2
             MIKAILA HERNANDEZ, ESQUIRE
             THE CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
 3
             666 BROADWAY AVENUE, FLOOR 7
             NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10012
 4
             AYANNA DENISE HILL, ESQUIRE
 5
             ACLU OF MISSISSIPPI - JACKSON
             P.O. BOX 2242
 6
             JACKSON, MS 39225
 7
             LORI SHERMAN, ESQUIRE
             FORWARD JUSTICE
 8
             ONE COPLEY PARKWAY, SUITE 302
             MORRISVILLE, NC 27560
 9
10
    ALSO PRESENT:
11
    TED HENIFIN, THIRD-PARTY MANAGER
    A.J. JOHNSON, ESQUIRE (VIA ZOOM)
12
     SUSAN RICHARDSON, ESQUIRE (VIA ZOOM)
     SUZANNE ARMOR, ESQUIRE (VIA ZOOM)
13
     JIM VINCH, ESQUIRE (VIA ZOOM)
     SUZANNE RUBINI, ESQUIRE (VIA ZOOM)
14
    MICHELLE WETHERINGTON, ESQUIRE (VIA ZOOM)
    MICHAEL CRESWELL, ESQUIRE (VIA ZOOM)
15
    GABE ALLEN, ESQUIRE (VIA ZOOM)
    EMILY C.R. EARLY, ESQUIRE (VIA ZOOM)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
2.4
25
```

IN OPEN COURT, OCTOBER 10, 2024

THE COURT: Terri, call the case, please.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Your Honor, this is United States of America versus the City of Jackson, Civil Action Number 3:12-cv-790-HTW-LGI, as well as related case, Civil Action Number 3:22-cv-686-HTW-LGI. We are here this afternoon for a status conference.

And at this time I'm going to ask the parties to state their names for the record starting with the plaintiff.

MR. FINGERHOOD: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. FINGERHOOD: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Karl Fingerhood, U.S. Department of Justice.

THE COURT: All right. Good to see you again.

MR. FINGERHOOD: Good to see you, Your Honor.

MS. WILLIAMS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Angela Williams for the United States.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. PAIGE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Mitzi Dease Paige, also for the United States.

THE COURT: Okay, then.

MR. FURRH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Roy Furrh with the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality.

THE COURT: All right.

```
1
            MR. CAMPBELL: David Campbell with the Mississippi
 2
       Department of Environmental Quality.
            THE COURT: Thank you.
 3
            All right. Let's go to the defense first, and then I
 4
       come back to the intervenors. Okay?
 5
 6
            MR. MARTIN: Judge, Drew Martin, city attorney for
 7
       Jackson.
            THE COURT: All right. Good.
 8
 9
           MS. CARR: Sheridan Carr, special assistant to the city
       attorney, City of Jackson.
10
11
            THE COURT: Okay.
12
           MR. WILLIAMSON: Terrell Williamson, City of Jackson.
13
            THE COURT: Good. Glad to see you again. Thank you.
            Next. Good afternoon.
14
15
           MS. SHERMAN: My name is Lori Sherman with Forward
       Justice, and I'm here on behalf of the plaintiff
16
17
       intervenors, and I have two of my colleagues with me.
18
            THE COURT: Okay. Can you just state their names?
19
            MS. HILL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Ayanna Hill
20
       with the ACLU representing the intervenor plaintiffs.
2.1
            THE COURT: Thank you.
22
            MS. HERNANDEZ: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Mikaila
23
       Hernandez with the Center for Constitutional Rights for
24
       plaintiff intervenors.
25
            THE COURT: You want to spell your name?
```

```
1
           MS. HERNANDEZ: Mikaila, M-I-K-A-I-L-A, Hernandez,
 2
       H-E-R-N-A-N-D-E-Z.
 3
            THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
           MS. HERNANDEZ: And we also have someone online as
 4
      well.
 5
 6
            THE COURT: All right. Thank you so much.
 7
            And would the person online who corresponds with her,
       would that person identify that person?
 8
 9
           MS. EARLY: Yes. Good morning, Your Honor. Yes.
10
              I froze. I'm sorry. My name is Emily Early with
11
       the --
12
            THE COURT: All right, Ms. Early. Go ahead.
           MS. EARLY: -- Center for Constitutional Rights and
13
       also plaintiffs intervenors.
14
15
            THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
            Now let's go to defense over here, and then I'll come
16
17
      back to the remaining parties.
18
           MR. HENIFIN: Ted Henifin, interim third-party manager.
19
            THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
20
           MS. WILSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Malissa
2.1
      Wilson, counsel for the interim third-party mgr, here with
22
       counsel Paul Calamita and Mitch McGuffey.
23
            THE COURT: All right. Gentlemen, good afternoon.
24
       Thank you. All right.
25
            Now, do I have anybody else? Okay. So have all the
```

```
1
       introductions been completed? Apparently so.
            MR. ALLEN: Your Honor, there are some folks online.
 2
 3
      Would you like to identify ourselves?
            THE COURT: Well, why don't you.
 4
 5
            MR. ALLEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is
 6
       Gabe Allen from the U.S. Department of Justice for the
7
      United States.
 8
            THE COURT: Okay. Next?
 9
           MR. JOHNSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. My name is
       A.J. Johnson. I'm here for the interim third-party manager.
10
11
            THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Johnson.
12
            Next?
           MS. RICHARDSON: Susan Richardson for Patrick Townsend.
13
       I'm here for the City of Jackson.
14
15
            THE COURT:
                       Okay. Ms. Richardson.
            Next?
16
17
           MS. ARMOR: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Suzanne Armor
18
      with the United States Environmental Protection Agency.
19
            THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon.
20
            Next?
2.1
            MR. VINCH: Good afternoon. I'm Jim Vinch. I'm an
22
       attorney with the USEPA in Washington, DC.
23
            THE COURT: Okay. Thank you so much.
24
           Next?
25
           MS. RUBINI: Good afternoon. My name is Suzanne
```

```
1
       Rubini. I'm with the USEPA Region 4.
 2
            THE COURT: Say that again now?
 3
            MS. RUBINI: Suzanne Rubini with USEPA Region 4.
            THE COURT: All right. Thank you so much.
 4
            Next?
 5
            MS. WETHERINGTON: Good afternoon. Michelle
 6
7
       Wetherington, USEPA Region 4.
 8
            THE COURT: Thank you.
 9
            Next?
            MR. CRESWELL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I'm Michael
10
11
       Creswell, USEPA Region 4.
12
            THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
13
            Anybody else?
            All right. Apparently not. All right. So, then, we
14
15
       are prepared to begin this status conference, and the intent
16
       of these proceedings is just what I stated. It's a status
       conference. And so this status conference will allow
17
18
       Mr. Henifin to give us an update, and then I would like to
19
       converse with some of my governmental people over here to my
20
       right to see what they are up to and what they have to say
21
       about this status conference, as well as what they have been
22
       doing.
23
            So, Mr. Henifin, are you ready to proceed?
24
            MR. HENIFIN: I am, Your Honor.
25
            THE COURT: And, Mr. Henifin, I would like for you to
```

provide as much detail as you wish on these various matters that you will be apprising us on. So take your time.

MR. HENIFIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

2.1

THE COURT: I might have some questions during your presentation to sharpen some of the edges, because I might want to bring out some other points, but in the meantime, take as much time as you want. And if you would, when you switch categories, could you tell us the headings for those various categories?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Now go ahead.

MR. HENIFIN: Certainly. And so I'll start with a general category. A year ago, just about exactly a year ago, you signed the order for the sewer system, and we are celebrating that one-year anniversary, so we will talk a little about that. But I think in general, we are really doing well in many areas, and I'll start with sewer. And I appreciate the opportunity to update folks.

We also just ended a quarter, and we are preparing our quarterly update, which will be due at the end of this month, so I don't have all of that information in front of me, so this status conference is kind of interim highlights of what will be in the quarterly report that will be due at the end of the month, and you can look forward to seeing that sometime around Halloween. I don't think it will be a

trick; should be a treat.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With that, we will continue sewer issues. The order contained a number of priority projects, and I would say the critical one were the 215 emergency sewer failures that were listed by address in the order. I stood before you a year ago and estimated as you tried to pin me down on how long it would take to get those done at two to three years. happy to report to the Court today that all of those have been resolved one year after the order was signed. So those were -- if you recall, that was raw sewage that was coming out on the streets and private property and public property throughout the city, something that just isn't normal in any U.S. city. You know, you might have a few of those going on at any given time and awaiting repair, but the fact that we had 215 listed in the order and there were actually others we found along the way that were putting sewage in the streets of Jackson on a daily basis and had been doing so for years was just unheard of.

So we have taken the opportunity to go out and repair -- most of those required repairing pipes underground that had collapsed. We did all of this without the benefit of any federal resources. You recall that all of the money that has come to Jackson has been for the drinking water system. We used local dollars to fund the work that was required, and largely it was individual repairs at each of

those 215 locations that made that happen.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Henifin, I want you to emphasize two points. One is the raw sewage that was spewing from the ground. Would you describe that?

MR. HENIFIN: So that is exactly what it is. It is untreated sewage. It is nasty and smelly and shouldn't be -- it is a public health hazard. The City was required to put signs up next to these locations as part of their consent decree obligations, but they continued to flow for months and months and years and years. There were many, one of which you witnessed during our tour, but there were several in neighborhoods where it just -- and it was across the city. It wasn't isolated to any particular socioeconomic neighborhood. There were nice neighborhoods, they were challenged neighborhoods, and everyone was sharing equally in this really public health hazard and just quality of life. Just it made your neighborhood a much worse to be with sewage flowing.

THE COURT: Well, just to put more illustration on your comments, I will add how horrific those incidents were to have raw sewage that normally would be flushed down a toilet popping out of the ground in locations all over the city, attended with their horrible odors and with the public feeling helpless about the matter. So these sewage eruptions were occurring all over the city, and there were

multiple.

2.1

How many would you say there were again?

MR. HENIFIN: There were 215 listed in the order. We think the total that we repaired was closer to 300.

THE COURT: 300 eruptions. You know, the one that I visited at first was out on Northside Drive, and it was less than 50 yards, would you say, or 25 yards from the nursing home?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And the sewage was coming directly out of the ground, just spewing, just like a little geyser coming out of the ground, raw sewage, fit only for a commode. But it was coming out of the ground. It had been there. There were no warning signs around it. There was no indication to the public it was there other than the horrible smell that was being generated. But there were no signs up warning the public or advising the public of what was happening out there. Nor were there any signs that a sign had ever been up.

In fact, that situation had been recurrent and had lasted for quite a while until I took over the sewage matter, and then we started designating the areas in priority which had to be dealt with.

Now, Mr. Henifin, I don't want to get ahead of your presentation, but when you started working on the sewage

2.1

project, you didn't address immediately -- all of these outdoor eruptions immediately because you first had to deal with the sewage eruptions inside the homes.

MR. HENIFIN: They were kind of related, Your Honor. Those only typically happen during rainy weather, but we have been addressing those at the same time.

THE COURT: But when you first started, you had to deal with the sewage eruptions inside the various homes, and at -- and when those occurred, when the raw sewage invaded the homes around Jackson, how would you describe those as to how thick the sewage was or how prevalent it was?

MR. HENIFIN: It wasn't -- it is not terribly prevalent in homes, but when it happens in someone's home, obviously it's a huge disruption and expensive cleanup. And it will continue to happen during rainy weather even with our operation of the sewer until we can find all the sources of rainwater that get into the system, but we have minimized that in many cases and continue to try to focus on preventing it.

THE COURT: So then when you undertook this project of adding this sewage to the water matter, then you had to address this sewage matter immediately because it was a health hazard.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, so then as you had a few moments ago,

you had hundreds of such incidents around the city of Jackson.

You mentioned something about signs to warn. I never saw any signs.

MR. HENIFIN: There actually were a number that were in place.

THE COURT: Where were they?

2.1

MR. HENIFIN: There were signs basically warning the public that raw sewage was a health hazard, to avoid it, that there was going to be work to fix it at some point. And going back to the one that you saw originally, we did find the sign later on a barricade overtop of a storm hold because they were concerned someone might fall into the storm -- manhole, and so they moved the sign barricade over to that even though it was originally intended to be on the sewer. So in defense, the system -- they were trying to put signs up where they could, and I think in many cases the signs were there.

THE COURT: I didn't see them.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, continue on.

MR. HENIFIN: The other large item in the order as a priority project was to address the 2200 unaddressed service requests. These are things people had called the City to have -- report a sewer issue, and no one had actually gone

out and looked at any of those 2200 different locations. So when the order was signed and we took responsibility for the sewer system, we started investigating those 2200, meaning we had to go to them, figure out what the issue was, is it active, is it still a problem?

I'm happy to report that we are down to under 200 of those left after one year. So in one year, we have done over 2,000 of those unaddressed service requests. So we should have the rest of them finished by the end of November barring any other changes that we have going along. So definitely by the end of year. Our goal is to have them done by the end of November. And that -- in many cases, there was nothing left to do. In other cases, there was a repair needed to be made. But of the 2200 that were reported, again, we have seen and visited over 2,000 of those in this first year.

Treatment plant compliance has significantly improved. So our treatment plants, we have got three, and one in particular is the large one that handles most of the wastewater treatment in Jackson, which is the Savanna Street plant on the Pearl River. That has had traditional problems with bypasses, prohibited bypasses, and permit exceedances, and we have eliminated those sig- -- or reduced those significantly and over the last several months haven't had any prohibited bypasses or permit exceedances. A lot of

2.1

that is due to the contract operator and maybe the way they were operating the plant. We have been helping them understand the better ways to operate the plant and how to get more capacity through the plant, and that is proving to be very significant improvements. We still have a lot of investment that needs to be made at the Savanna Street plant, capital investment. We have identified about 36 million in what I call critical needs. We haven't identified a funding source yet. And by the end of the year, we owe that plan to the plaintiffs, and we will have that submitted to the parties by the end of December, a detailed plan of how we will accomplish those.

THE COURT: Let me say just something else -MR. HENIFIN: Sure.

THE COURT: -- I just thought about. On this matter of signs, I wasn't talking about JXN Water or sewage company that you are now directing not putting the signs up. I know you're supposed to put some up now, but before that, it was the City's responsibility to put the sign up, wasn't it?

MR. HENIFIN: Yeah. And they were -- the City had put many of those up. That's what I -- not that I like to defend the City for a lot of things, but they were getting the signs up on these overflows.

THE COURT: But as I said before, I didn't see them.

MR. HENIFIN: Yeah. The one that we visited, you

2.1

definitely didn't see. And there were overflows that the signs might have been knocked over. They had been up for a long time. But there were many signs in the system.

THE COURT: Well, but going back to this -- this situation, was there work being done by the City on those matters?

MR. HENIFIN: No. Most of those just signs were put up. So the difference is we don't have to put signs up now because we don't have dry weather chronic overflows.

THE COURT: Well I ask that because I took it upon myself just to ride around Jackson because I have to come to work.

MR. HENIFIN: There were little yard signs. You might have missed it, potentially. I'm not doubting that you didn't see them, Your Honor. There were 215 locations. I didn't visit them all, and I know there weren't signs at every one I visited, but what I'm saying is there were a number of places that I did see signs that were posted. They look like the little real estate signs, you know, about this big.

THE COURT: You also might remember that from time to time I called to tell you when homeowners were complaining that nothing had been done on their property, either in their yards or in their homes, but that was on the City's watch.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

2.1

THE COURT: That is before I took over this matter concerning the sewage.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I'd call and I would tell you how people were calling disturbed, that people who said they had to move out of their houses because of the stench and because of the raw sewage there on their floors and how they had to vacate their houses and all, and also their complaints that they were calling the City's alleged hotline but couldn't get anybody. That was a prevalent complaint that they were calling and couldn't get anybody, which is what led JXN Water to put up -- or to -- to establish its own telephone hotline on these matters.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Because so many citizens were calling and could not get anybody on the telephone. Well, I just want to make sure that I cleared for any listener my comments, because the comments I made about the signs were not directed at a criticism of you and your crew. This is something that was supposed to have been done by the City, which had not been done, as far as I can see.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So, now, go ahead and finish your report.

MR. HENIFIN: Sure. And when you signed the order on

sewer about a year ago, if you recall, there was a 30-day public comment period prior to that with about -- over 95 percent of the public comments supporting this move to move sewer under the control of the interim third-party manager, so, again, a lot of public support for making this happen. I believe we have delivered by eliminating these chronic sewer problems where the sewer was flowing in the streets.

We are responsive. Not -- you know, we still hear some challenges getting through to our call center, and we've tried to investigate all those and figure out what's going on, but for the most part, we have been very responsive, hearing a lot of positive comments continue from citizenry on what we have accomplished to date in the sewer system, and, again, we are looking forward to even bigger and better things over the next year.

I'm going to move now to drinking water, Your Honor. So as of February, and I think I reported this in the last status conference, the system is really operating as designed, meaning we can operate at a little bit lower pressure coming out of the plant. At night, when folks aren't using water, the elevated storage tanks fill, and during the day when people are, that water is put back into the system and helps keep the pressure equal through the system without having to crank up pumps at the plant on an off-and-on basis.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Prior to this, prior to the JXN Water work and even early in our work, the only place you could measure pressure in the system was at the actual treatment plants as we pushed water out, and the only feedback we got was the elevation in the tanks, and it all didn't make a lot of sense most of the time. So we were constantly turning pumps on and off, which we were contributing to our own problem of breaking lines. As you turn a large pump on and turn a small pump off, there is hammer or pressure that goes through the system and actually stresses the pipes at a higher pressure than they would normally see, and the more frequently you do that, the more you loosen up joints. You cause weak spots in pipes to break, so we were kind of causing our own problem on a lot of the pipe breaks we were dealing with, and the system had been doing that for years.

You can imagine you are running a -- and these are big pumps. We are talking a pump that moves 8 million gallons of water a day and you switch to a pump that moves 32 million gallons a day, you can imagine the pressure and the volume changes pretty instantaneously when you do that. There is not a soft start, which you have in modern treatment plants, no variable frequency starts, so these were instantaneous, just go from one smaller pump to a giant pump to get the pressure back up and get the volume you need in the system as we were losing so much water.

2.1

Again, since February or so, we have seen the system respond much more so like it was designed to operate, and we can attribute almost all of that to opening valves. We have found hundreds of valves in the closed position, many of them in big transmission mains. We also found several in the open position that needed to be closed where they were isolating the system from -- we have got a groundwater system and a surface water system, and those weren't isolated. So as we have made those changes, got the system valved correctly --

THE COURT REPORTER: Slow down, please.

MR. HENIFIN: Sorry. I'm getting excited. I'm talking about technical valves and water.

So as we were able to isolate the system, get the valves open in the correct positions throughout the system. It now can move water the way it was designed to, and that has been wonderful for the water system, made our jobs easier now as we have moved forward. We are not seeing anywhere the number of breaks that we had to repair to start with, and we have backed down on the number of crews that have to be out on a daily basis, and we are starting to get into a rhythm, a maintenance rhythm, along the distribution system.

That has also resulted in a significant decrease in the amount of water lost. So as we started this, water loss had

2.1

been estimated at various numbers, and in real numbers, or as close as we can estimate, we were putting out about 50 to 55 million gallons of water a day, meaning what we measured that went out of the two treatment plants combined was somewhere in that 50 to 55 million gallons a day range.

What our consumers need, what our customers need, is about 18 million gallons a day. And we now have accurate enough meters on enough meters in the ground to verify that. I had estimated it early on as 15 million gallons. The meter information we have now says we need about 18 million gallons a day to serve our customers. We are putting 55 into the system. We need 18 -- say round to 20, because my math is easier if we do it that way. We are losing about 35 million gallons a day when we started. That is a significant amount of water loss when you only need 18 to meet the demand.

So we have been looking for big leaks and small leaks and leaks everywhere in the system, and as of August, the amount of water we had to put in the system was 25 percent less than it was a year ago in August. So we only have to put in 40 million gallons a day today as opposed to 55 million gallons a day. Still, significantly more than the 18 we need to serve our customers.

We are still on the hunt for water leaks. We think most of these now are leaks subsurface, so it's water that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

is not reaching the surface; it is moving from a broken waterline underground to an opening in a storm drain or a sewer line underground, never making it to the surface. Much harder to detect. And we are deploying new technologies to try to figure out where those might be to dig up and look. In fact, we have got four different contractors that say their technology can do that for us. We have put them, at different times, in the same locations to give us the pinpoint location where they say we need to dig down to find the leak. We haven't finished this yet, so we don't know who the winner is, because they won't be there when we start digging, and we will dig down in the locations that each of these four technology companies claim to be able to locate leaks and see who is actually accurate. Assuming one or two of them are, we will continue to use them over the next year to try to find more of these subsurface leaks throughout the system.

Unfortunately, if none of them are accurate, we are back to square zero in trying to find a technology to help us find these unknown leaks. But our goal is to continue to look for these large leaks, small leaks, whatever is contributing to this lost water that now is somewhere in the 18 to 20 million gallons a day range and bring that — continue to bring that down over the next several years, ideally to the point where we only need somewhere around

30 million gallons a day. Still significantly more than our customers use. We get to that point, we can supply all of the City's water demands from just the O.B. Curtis plant and we will be able to close the J.H. Fuel plant, which will save millions of dollars in annual operating costs, which would be great for us going forward to reinvest in the system as opposed to having to operate a second plant just to put the water out into the community that doesn't get to anybody.

So, again, goal is all water production happens at the O.B. Curtis plant, ideally within the next few years, but we have to get the water demand, get rid of the losses down below 30 million gallons a day to be able to comfortably do that.

The capacity of O.B. Curtis is 50 million gallons a day. It will peak up at times, so we need to make sure we have enough reserve capacity, and that is why we wouldn't start making that decision to close the J.H. Fuel plant until we get to the 30 million gallon-a-day range. When we start getting below that, we will still have plenty of capacity to produce all the water we need at the O.B. Curtis plant.

So that is our future. We are working hard to get there, but a lot of water to still find to make that happen.

THE COURT: Now, I have raised this question before,

and you diligently have been seeking an answer to this question, so you know what question it is.

MR. HENIFIN: I think so.

2.1

THE COURT: Because I asked this question the first time I became acquainted with the system and recognized this water loss, and I wanted to have a quantification in terms of dollars, how much does that mean in dollar loss to us, to the citizenry, how much money is going into the ground or wherever that water loss is taking us, and that's a complicated question, I understand; is that correct?

MR. HENIFIN: I keep telling you that because I haven't been able to produce you an answer yet. Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I know it. And you said that. And I asked the question because I was trying to get a report that would mean even more to the citizenry to know in terms of dollars — how much in terms of dollars does this water loss cost when it is not making it to the homes after it has been processed. Now, we are talking about processed water, aren't we?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. Fully treated drinking water.

THE COURT: So we are talking about water that has been drawn into the plant to be processed with various chemicals with the human labor and also with the chemical labor to change that water from non-drinkable water, nonconsumable

2.1

water, to consumable water to go to the households. And if we put this on a basis of 100 percent of what is being drawn from these sources to be tempered and cleansed so that it is fit for human consumption and also fit for human use, such as bathing, dishwashings, et cetera, but to go to domestic households, and we are losing such a huge amount of that hundred percent that comes out that never makes it there, it is waylaid somewhere in between the plant and to the homes, and, again, tell the audience and anyone who reads the record how much of that 100 percent does not make it.

MR. HENIFIN: Currently about 50 percent of that 100 percent doesn't make it.

THE COURT: 50 percent of that purified water does not make it to the households. Instead, it's lost in transit.

Now, when we went out to look at Atkins Boulevard, I think it was -- is that the name of the street?

MR. HENIFIN: Yeah. Colonial -- where the Colonial Golf Course was, in that area.

THE COURT: Right. Now, out there when we first looked at it, remember there was something like 5 million gallons of water that was being lost every day just in that one location. And now we are talking about more than one location, but 5 million gallons were being lost. And remember the disturbance was -- was manifest when one asked how long that had been going on. We had different estimates

as to how long that particular incident had been occurring,
5 million gallons of processed water being lost every day of
the week. And we had different estimates on how long it had
been occurring; is that correct?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So did we ever nail down how long that had been? Because, remember, at one time we were told it had been going on not for a week or a month but had been going on for seven years.

MR. HENIFIN: We don't have an exact date. We were never able to nail that down, but from all anecdotal evidence, it was several years at least.

THE COURT: Several years. And I remember when I went out there, the fear was that it had been going on for seven years. Now, that is some huge mathematics involved. That is 365 days times seven, and then multiply that 5 million gallons of lost processed water per day and what that comes to, and then as a result of that, I first asked my questions in terms of dollars: What does that mean for all of that processing and all of that loss of 5 million gallons? And that was just in one spot at the time.

MR. HENIFIN: We have probably found two more that size and repaired them since then. But --

THE COURT: But I don't know if the public recognizes that after you were shown all that, you and your crew

```
repaired all that in what kind of time frame?
 1
 2
            MR. HENIFIN: The water leaks have been repaired over
 3
       the period of a little -- about 22 months.
 4
            THE COURT: And so that has been repaired.
 5
            MR. HENIFIN: That one was repaired within months after
       we found it.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: Okay. So that was repaired in 22 months.
            MR. HENIFIN: That particular leak was repaired within
 8
 9
       three months of us finding it.
            THE COURT: Within three months, but yet we were told
10
11
       that this leak had been ongoing for years. And so you and
12
       your crew got out there and dug the necessary entrenchments,
13
       located the pipe. How big was that pipe? 36? What was it?
            MR. HENIFIN: 42-inch.
14
15
            THE COURT: 42. And located the pipe that was ruptured
       that was causing this huge, huge leak, and it produced a
16
17
       lake, did it not?
18
            MR. HENIFIN: Small lake and a big waterfall.
19
            THE COURT: The waterfall was pretty, though, wasn't
20
       it?
2.1
            MR. HENIFIN: It was down to the creek. It came up in
22
       the little lake and then rolled over the side and went down
23
       into Purple Creek.
24
            THE COURT: And it was a lake, wasn't it?
25
            MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.
```

THE COURT: In fact, you all rode out there one time, 1 2 at least your crew did, because you wanted to know how deep the lake was. Remember that? 3 MR. HENIFIN: Couldn't reach the bottom of it. 4 5 THE COURT: Yeah. At first, you couldn't. But you finally recognized how deep the lake was that was purely a 6 7 manmade lake from this water loss, and you took out there 8 with you on the boat, what, something that was about -- the 9 pole was 36 inches, I think -- I mean 36 --10 MR. HENIFIN: 35 feet long. 11 THE COURT: 35 feet long. And that first one -- that 12 first foray didn't reach the bottom. And so then you had to 13 take another pole out there to see how deep that lake was. And so how long was that particular pole? 14 15 MR. HENIFIN: Well, the first one was probably, like, 20 feet, but it was right at 35 feet to get to the bottom. 16 17 THE COURT: So you got to the bottom. And how deep was 18 that lake? 19 MR. HENIFIN: 35, 36 feet. 20 THE COURT: 35 feet. Okay. And that wasn't the only 21 one. 22 MR. HENIFIN: We haven't found any quite like -- that 23 deep, but we found plenty that were leaking lots of water, 24 so about the same volume, just creating really pretty 25 wetlands in various parts of the city.

THE COURT: So now with that as a backdrop, that particular -- that particular place with its peculiar problem -- I would like to say peculiar, but there were some -- some that was close to it, but that particular situation was evident to the naked eye. If anyone had walked over there, then the person would have seen that lake and also would have seen that waterfall. And, by the way, how tall would you say that waterfall was?

MR. HENIFIN: About -- like, the bank of the creek right there, maybe 10, 12 feet, so it was just running down the rocks there along the bank of the creek.

THE COURT: So this water was flowing down 10 or 12 feet of rock and then headed on to this lake that was later created.

Now, what I was saying is this, is that to the naked eye, one could have walked over there and seen all of this and then, if the person had any real interest in it, would investigate it and recognize that all of this came from a ruptured -- ruptured pipe. But a lot of these other leaks around the city where you are losing water which amounts to this 50 percent loss is not evident by a lake or waterfall; is that correct?

MR. HENIFIN: That is correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And so that water loss is simply being lost out of ruptured pipes, and these pipes are underground.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HENIFIN: We believe so, yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And so then the naked eye can't detect that on topsoil. They have to get beneath the surface in order to encounter this leak and understand how really dreadful it is. Am I correct?

MR. HENIFIN: We are using -- the technologies that are being deployed are typically acoustic of some sort to listen -- to listen to pipes, put devices on hydrants, valves. Our meters themselves all have listening capabilities. Trying to -- you try to get through that noise and you actually use some artificial intelligence to look at a big data set with a lot of noise in it to try to pinpoint where an actual leak might be happening, and it is pretty new technology and not overly proven is why we are trying. We really have this almost contest among four different technologists to prove out their -- their equipment to see if it would work here in Jackson on our condition and actually find some of those leaks, because you can't go around digging up every street looking for them. So you've got to listen and hope you can come up with technology that can find it.

THE COURT: Well, I used the example I just did about the waterfall and the lake because someone familiar with that would think that all you had to do was go around town and look for another lake or look for another waterfall when

2.1

they wouldn't recognize that these waters have not surfaced, that they are subsurface, and where they go after that is only explained by into the ground. And so you got to go down under the surface in order to find all these other leaks. They all are not as apparent as the one I said, although the one I said was sitting there for a terribly long time and nothing was done about it.

MR. HENIFIN: Well, in defense, Your Honor, you know, you see water coming out of the ground and a waterfall, you might think it's an underground spring. You might there was some other source. I don't know that anyone would immediately jump to the thought that all of that water was coming from a drinking waterline, but --

THE COURT: Let's go back to that lake.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, sir. I won't try to defend it any longer.

THE COURT: No. That just won't get it, you know, because anybody who had walked out there, they might see what they thought to be a scenic waterfall, but when they took another step about 10 yards back and they see this hole in the ground that is a now lake, they recognize that was not a lake, and they would recognize that that is something called a huge leak, and it is just sitting right there. And then after you all pumped out some of the water and one could actually for a while there see part of the pipe, then

2.1

one knew that this was all emanating from a broken pipe.

And if any city workers had gone out there, they certainly would have seen this and not been confused about a waterfall or confused about the lake. They would have known this is something called a horrendous leak. And on top of that, the City did have apparatus to indicate how much water was being lost and not getting to the homes, did it not?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. That was a fairly straightforward math problem.

THE COURT: And that same -- that same inquiry that was not that difficult to determine would have shown that a hundred percent of the water being manufactured at the water plant was not getting to the homes and, instead, less than 50 percent -- because now that is down to 50 percent, that is an improvement, isn't it?

MR. HENIFIN: It's sad, but, yes, it is an improvement.

THE COURT: And so it was even less than 50 percent of
the manufactured 100 percent of the water coming from the
plants not getting to the homes in Jackson.

MR. HENIFIN: In rough numbers, probably 33 percent was getting to them.

THE COURT: 33 percent. So you are talking about just a little over one-third of water that was being produced, processed by human endeavor, by the addition of chemicals that cost, by the public expecting to receive the water that

2.1

was processed for public use, only a little bit over one-third was actually making it to the homes, and since these leaks were ongoing and deep and prevalent and consequential, that had a whole lot to do with the Jackson water woes during that time period, but yet that just went unattended.

So then, as I just stated, when we went out there and looked at this particular problem, we saw that this water was not making it there because all of that water that was in the lake and all of that water that was in the waterfall was processed. It was drinkable. It was showerable. All of that water. Go out there and wash your dishes out there, because all of that water was processed, and yet we were told that this condition had lasted for years. So then you knew exactly where I was coming from when I asked what was the cost.

MR. HENIFIN: And I commit to you that we will have a cost for you in this quarterly report.

THE COURT: That is what I want.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I want to see, and I know the citizenry want to see, just how much money the water company before you came was losing on these leaks and how much of the citizenry was hurt not only in the loss of this treated water but also out of dollar bills out of their pockets,

because the City was not collecting all of the bills that
were out there. A lot of folk had been excused from paying.
The City was not collecting various moneys that was due the
City because people were not paying their water bills. And
I don't know if that is in your report either about the
increase in the number of people or percentage of people who
are now paying their bills. Did you intend to mention that?

MR. HENIFIN: Yeah, I have got that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, then I'm going to stop here and let you get back to your report.

MR. HENIFIN: Well, I'm not going to let you leave this leak issue alone quite yet, because we will get you a cost, but I would like to also put on the record it contributed to the pressure problems we were having, because you are losing water, you can't keep pressure up throughout the system, and it is also a reason we have to keep the fuel plant open, so it's not just the cost of producing the water but the whole fact that we have to run a second plant and that we had pressure problems throughout the system were all aggravated by this water loss.

And good systems don't exceed 10 percent water loss.

In fact, that is kind of the borderline EPA thinks is acceptable, and they still want you working on water loss if it was at 10 percent, and, again, we are at 50 percent and trying to get our -- work our way down to 10 would be the

goal ultimately.

2.1

That is enough on water loss.

THE COURT: Well, I have told you this in our various discussions. When I have reviewed everything that is going on, because that is my job, I'm impressed at the efforts that you have made, you and your crew, and they have done a wonderful job in trying to address these issues, but I still do not think that the public thoroughly understood the humongous problems that faced the water company when you came. I don't think they understood that.

MR. HENIFIN: I think people just --

THE COURT: I don't think they still understand it, but --

MR. HENIFIN: People just want clean, safe drinking water at the tap every day, so they don't really care about all the other problems. They just want it there.

THE COURT: Well, but it was overwhelming almost. I say almost because you have now been taming it. So it was not overwhelming. You have now underwhelmed it, and so I appreciate you, and I'm sure the citizens of Jackson share my comments about this, because there have been so many great changes in this matter, and if we were going to go and address it in its minutia, we would talk about all of the different areas that had to be put together.

MR. HENIFIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And there was this tremendous amount of effort that had to go into this, not only in getting people to pay but also in changing the call center; making sure the call times were appropriate; making sure the costs, whatever they had been in toto, are decreasing and how much chemicals had to be put in this water. And, I mean, it's on and on and on. Every aspect of this system had to be tweaked. So that is what I'm saying.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. Appreciate that.

THE COURT: All right. Go on back.

MR. HENIFIN: I've got a great team.

I'll pick it up here at water quality since we are talking about that. We're -- the lead and copper were water quality parameters we have to meet right now because we don't have the enhanced corrosion control fully in place. It, again, was an obligation. The City undertook that obligation back in 2016 as a result of some failed lead sampling. That work is finished at Fuel and under way at Curtis. We will have it done sometime next year at Curtis plant.

In the meantime, there's four water quality parameters we have to measure multiple times each month. And so you see those results, you can see we are making those -- we are actually meeting those parameters more and more of the time. So it's really a big improvement in the consistency of the

2.1

water. Those four parameters are pH, hardness, alkalinity, and dissolved inorganic carbon, and those have a good relationship to the corrosiveness of your water, which, again, could lead to leaching lead out of largely your home plumbing, but we have been able to get those — through the work of Jacobs, who is operating our plants, and work we are doing on the distribution system, we have been able to get much more consistent in those four parameters month to month. That has been a great success story as well. So water quality is meeting the MCLs, the maximum contaminant levels, set by the Safe Drinking Water Act, so the water quality has been great.

We report that all the time, but it has been wonderful to see an independent study that we had nothing to do with come to Jackson and validate exactly what we have been saying. So a Yale University study has been conducted by Ambria McDonald, a Ph.D. candidate at Yale. She leads the water sustainability group for the 3M Corporation. She's pursuing her Ph.D. She is a Jackson native. She saw the Jackson water crisis, heard a lot about what was going on in Jackson, decided that her Ph.D. would be around the Jackson water system and the water quality.

She came down and randomly selected and got volunteers at 26 homes and four businesses to allow them to do extensive testing of the water at their taps and found that

```
1
       every time our water met every maximum contaminant level,
 2
       met the Safe Drinking Water Act. So it has been great to
 3
       see that independent, because I'm always leery of people
       doing their own testing of our water without our knowledge,
 4
 5
       but this one -- she's got this short summary of her study
 6
       that shows that our water is safe. We had nothing to do
7
       with that, so it is great to get a little validation from an
 8
       outside source. Even if it is at Yale University, we still
 9
       think they are pretty good.
            There has been very few lead service lines --
10
11
            THE COURT: You know I can't let that go.
12
            MR. HENIFIN: There have been very few lead --
            THE COURT: First of all --
13
            MR. HENIFIN: I'm not going to get past that, am I?
14
15
            THE COURT: You tried to slide that in, huh?
            MR. HENIFIN: I did.
16
17
            THE COURT: Well, first of all, I do not know the lady.
18
       I have never met her. And in fact, I just know that she --
       based on what I read, that she is from Jackson.
19
20
       even know her race. What is her race?
2.1
            MR. HENIFIN: She is a Black woman, Your Honor.
22
            THE COURT: Okay. And so I just saw in that little
23
       blurb --
24
            MR. HENIFIN: I thought you knew all the families in
25
       Jackson. Everybody that gets up here, you seem to know
```

1 where they went to high school. I thought for sure you knew 2 the McDonald family. 3 THE COURT: No, I don't know her, and I don't know the 4 family either, to my knowledge. But she came down 5 unsolicited; is that correct? 6 MR. HENIFIN: Right. This was her decision to pursue 7 her Ph.D., and this was her -- her thesis is around water 8 quality and issues with water -- trusting water in the 9 Jackson water system. So she got an advisor. Her advisor is actually from Vanderbilt, I believe, on this, or 10 11 collaborator. And she has been down here doing this work on 12 her Ph.D. thesis. 13 THE COURT: I've never met her. Have you ever met her? MR. HENIFIN: Only online, Your Honor. 14 15 THE COURT: Only online. Okay. Is her study over? MR. HENIFIN: No. She is still working on, I guess, 16 17 writing her dissertation. I'm not sure what -- what the 18 next steps are. I never got beyond a bachelor's degree, so I'm not really sure how you get to that Ph.D. piece. 19 20 THE COURT: So that is what she is working on? So she 2.1 is supposed to submit this to her Ph.D. panel for her dissertation; is that it? 22 23 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Oh, I see. Okay. Did she give an ending 25 date on there?

MR. HENIFIN: She is working full-time, and people I know that have pursued a Ph.D. while they're working full-time, that ending date slides, typically, a little bit, but I didn't ask her, but I will try to find out, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm curious as to when she will be finished her study.

MR. HENIFIN: I'll find out.

2.1

THE COURT: Okay. But, again, state her conclusion so far. Again, state her conclusion.

MR. HENIFIN: Her conclusion is that the water matches what we are reporting as far as water quality meeting all of the Safe Drinking Water Act maximum contaminant levels. So safe drinking water is what we're providing. She confirmed that at the 30 locations she did the in-depth analysis, they're receiving the same water we say we are providing everybody.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Continue.

MR. HENIFIN: So lead service lines is a big topic because there's a lot of work going on across the nation on replacement of lead service lines. A new rule was just promulgated this week from EPA for a revision, I guess Lead and Copper -- LCR. Lead Copper Rule I, which is Improvement. Thank you. It's got a lot of initials, and it has changed a lot.

But essentially there is a lot more work to do on the part of a utility, water utility, related to lead service lines and lead in the water. As part of that, we are doing an inventory of all of our service lines across the city. Part of our inventory work is also with a predictive model, because you can imagine we couldn't go out and dig up 60,000 service lines across the city reasonably. We have done hundreds because the predictive model requires validation and calibration, meaning they predict where they think lead service lines might exist based on age of housing and other history pieces, and then they ask us to go out and dig up the line to see what it is actually made of, and they put that into the model, and we have done that now at over 500 locations.

And you can't just do it in one spot. You have to do it on the privately owned piece of line, the waterline that runs between the water meter and your house. That is your line. But we have to expose that and understand what that is made of. And then we have to do it on the city side somewhere between the water main and where it goes to the water meter. And typically we have to do a third one right on top of where it's connected to the water main, because there's what's called a gooseneck. It's a flexible part that ties into the valve that is actually connected to the water main, and many of those in many communities were made

2.1

of lead because they have to be bent in an interesting shape to allow the line basically to move a little bit as the ground moves around without pulling out of the main.

So we have to really do three, and we call them potholes. We use hydroexcavation, essentially a vacuum that sucks out the dirt so you don't make a lot of disturbance and you don't damage the pipe, and then you can see exactly what the pipe is made of. You record that, put it into your inventory, give it back to your model folks, they put all that data into the model, they run it again and say, okay, now you've got to go over to this location and we need these particular locations exposed and know what the material is.

The model will have about a 95 percent confidence level that they can predict where lead lines might be in the system. The good news in Jackson is we have less than ten identified. We have actually replaced the ones we have put our hands on, and every other one was on an abandoned service line of some sort from years ago. So just not very much lead in the Jackson system. So there is a positive about Jackson water system. We don't get a lot of those. Very little lead as far as the pipes go.

The other thing that was great to measure is the forever chemicals that a lot people are hearing in the news. PFAS and PFOA. They're polyfluorinated something. I'm sure someone here could tell me what they are. But they are used

in so many products. They are ubiquitous in our water systems across the country. They're used in Teflon.

They're used in Scotchgard, any kind of fire-retardant clothing, flooring manufacturers, carpet. It is everywhere.

We all have PFAS now already in our bodies because we have been exposed to it.

It is in most drinking water systems; it's in most wastewater systems. EPA, while they haven't promulgated a rule on a level, on a contaminant level, they have proposed some fairly low numbers that most people are worried to make. Here in Jackson, we have tested our water and our wastewater, and good news again: No PFAS, measurable PFAS, that we have to worry about. Not even close to these proposed levels. So Jackson doesn't have many lead lines, very few, almost none, and no PFAS. So we are ahead of the game in two areas that most people are struggling with across the country. So I like to hit the positives on our drinking water system. Not ahead of the game on the leakage yet, but we'll get there. I think that is all we have on the drinking water, if that's -- any other questions? Good.

THE COURT: Move to the next category.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, sir. We will go to a financial. A few things there. We just completed our 2023 audit. It had an unmodified opinion. For those who aren't familiar with audits, auditors really don't like to say anything, but the

best you can do is an unmodified opinion. We got that for our 2023 calendar year audit, and we will have that submitted to the parties with the quarterly report. But that was good news to get that done.

And then the biggest news for us financially is the Mississippi Local Governments and Rural Water Systems
Improvement Board, and that's the board created by the Mississippi Legislature to administer the drinking water state revolving loan fund money, has worked closely with us and they've approved an amended -- what's called an intended use plan, which lists out the projects that were going to use some of that state revolving loan fund money. That was \$450 million appropriated by Congress in 2023 -- end of -- end of 2022 calendar or fiscal year '23. That 450 million has to be used in accordance with the rules of that SRF program.

I am working with the State and the Health Department and this board. They have really leaned in to find ways to make those dollars available to us. That IUP, that intended use plan that has now been approved by the board on the 20th of September, once finalized will obligate nearly 360 million of the 450 million Congress appropriated for us. Great projects listed in there. Really going to be making some significant effort.

The first ones have been waiting for this approval on

the intended use plan. We have got design complete on the chemical feed building. And all the chemical feeds at the O.B. Curtis plant will be replaced from where they start to where they go into the system. That is a significant investment.

We will be changing the chlorine. I think I've mentioned before in this court that it is gaseous chlorine color that is used now, giant cylinders of gaseous chlorine. Very dangerous but widely used across the country for many years for water and wastewater chlorination. Been phased out in many places, especially where your plant is near a population, which in our case both of our plants are, and we'll be going to on-site chlorine generation, which is done with salt, so there's no hazardous chemical involved that needs to be stored in large quantities at the plant as there is today with the gaseous chlorine. And that is all in one package, one design. Design is complete, and we are working on getting that one under construction within the next few weeks, as soon as we get the final signatures on the loan agreement with the State.

I used loan agreement, and everyone turns their heads because the state revolving loan found is a loan fund.

Congress appropriated \$450 million to the state revolving loan fund for Jackson's drinking water system, but it is a zero-interest loan, principal forgiveness. This is all EPA

talk for grant, but they can't say grant. So there's no -we don't pay any of this back, but I talk in terms of it
being a loan because it is following the exact same process.
So there is a loan agreement for a zero-interest loan with
principal forgiveness. We would all like to have one of
those. We are very fortunate that Congress has provided
that for us.

The other pile of money they gave us was --

THE COURT: One second.

2.1

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: As far as that amount of money you just mentioned, that money has been dedicated, has it not?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes. It was -- it was specifically required to be used for the drinking water system in Jackson under the requirements of the state revolving loan fund, which are pretty stringent requirements about developing bidding packages, how you -- Davis-Bacon wages. There is a variety of requirements in there that make those pretty challenging to do anything except infrastructure projects with it, and that's exactly what we will be doing with it. And then of that 450, this intended use plan obligates about 360 million of it, and we will be providing updates to that over the next couple years to add more projects as we identify them that will use the balance of that 450 million.

THE COURT: But of that 450, 360 has been committed --

```
1
       have been committed already?
 2
            MR. HENIFIN: Under this intended use plan, yes, sir.
 3
            THE COURT: And so that money is already earmarked for
       various projects?
 4
 5
            MR. HENIFIN: Correct, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: And, of course, those projects are projects
 6
7
       that meet the specifications of the regulations --
 8
            MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.
 9
            THE COURT: -- on -- for the expenditures of those
       moneys?
10
11
            MR. HENIFIN: Correct.
12
            THE COURT: Okay. Go to the next matter.
13
            MR. HENIFIN: The balance of the money appropriated by
14
       Congress was 150 million through an emergency appropriation
15
       section of the Safe Drinking Water Act referred to as
       1442(b). That is the section of the Safe Drinking Water
16
17
       Act. We've spent over a hundred million of that to date.
18
            So going back to our leak fixing, our valve changing,
19
       our valve repairs, our finding the valves, repairing the
20
       drinking water plants, operating the drinking water plants,
2.1
       that is where that money has been spent. So we have had an
22
       advantage over the City in getting leaks fixed and water
23
       losses. We have had this resource, this 1442(b) dollars,
24
       and we have gone through over a hundred million of it.
25
            We will have spent the 150 probably within the next --
```

2.1

by the next -- say sometime next spring, we will have the balance of that obligated. So that has been a real shot in the arm for the water system to have that money available. It was a great thing that Congress did, and the fact that the EPA found this -- this section of the 14- -- or Section 1442(b) of the Safe Drinking Water Act to let us use this water in a -- or money in a much more flexible way than the state revolving loan fund meaning we can pay for operating and maintenance work that you can't do under the SRF. So this 150 million has been critical for these early successes that we have done, so we are very pleased to have that and appreciate EPA making that happen.

THE COURT: And were any of the personnel involved in that negotiations and decision-making a part of the courthouse crowd here?

MR. HENIFIN: Your Honor, I think there may be a couple online. I'm not sure who was actually -- helped get that money and figure out what -- the 600 million is a large mystery. Where the number came from and how the appropriation, I think this all was behind closed doors with EPA and Congress, but I wasn't in any of those rooms, so I don't really know, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We were the beneficiary, in other words.

MR. HENIFIN: We were the beneficiary, yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And as great beneficiaries, we know

how to spend it appropriately.

2.1

MR. HENIFIN: We spend it appropriately and we are thankful we have it, yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Go to your next matter.

MR. HENIFIN: You asked about local revenues and growth and collection, and there is a lot of discussion about collection rate, and collection rate is a -- while a seemingly clear metric, it is really not in this case because it is related to how much you actually bill, and if you are billing a lot more than you used and even collecting more, your collection rate might not reflect what it used to look like.

So, for example, say we were billing in stats, real numbers, so in December of 2022, when you signed the order, we billed \$4.9 million to our customers for water, and we collected 4.4. That was a 90 percent collection rate.

Sounds great. But the billing of 4.9 is about half of what we should have been billing.

So today, last month, August, we billed 9.8 million, and we've collected 5.8 million of that 9.8. That is only a collection rate of 60 percent, but it was over 1.4 million more than the month reported when we started at 90 percent collection rate. So there are some people that like to talk a lot about this collection rate number, but it is not really the real number. The real number is how much money

do -- how much are you billing and how much are you collecting and if they change in time, which they have because we are billing a lot more people for water than were billed in the past.

The other thing that gets pointed out is, well, it's all because we increased the rates, and we did increase the rates in January of this year by about 15 percent. So when you really look -- if we were billing 5 million in December of '22, if you only added 15 percent to that, that would be somewhere in the 5.8 million, and yet we are billing 9.8 million. So it is not due to rate increase. It is due to we are working hard at getting people to pay their bills. And we've still got a long way to go.

So over the last several months, the average has been -- so in the first six months of this -- from October, when JXN Water was given the responsibility for all the revenue, as you recall with the sewer order, we assumed all the responsibility for debt and revenue related to water and the sewer. And in October, our net water revenue was 4.6 million. Last October when you signed the order.

It is averaging now, over the last six months, 6.1. So, again, \$1.5 million per month increase in that short period of time. And that is only because we are busy making sure people get accurate bills and that they pay their bills. We have not even started shutting off single family

yet. That is within weeks.

The problem is we have got 11,000 customers that are more than 60 days in arrears, single-family residential customers. We don't have the capacity to turn them all off at once and then get them all restored fast enough, so we need to modify our billing system, which is designed to automate this process, that if anyone is delayed and doesn't pay, it automatically kicks out a letter, tells them they are behind, and then if they don't pay, it automatically kicks out a work order to go turn them off. And you can imagine if we flipped that switch right now and created 11,000 work orders, we would go under.

So we need to modify our own system to meter it out in pieces that we can actually manage. Because if you cut someone off and they pay their bill, they expect you to turn them back on. We can't do that at 11,000 properties in a short period of time. So we are going to be starting in small groups, but sometime in the next few weeks, we will be ready to pull the trigger on the definition of who gets the first turnoffs, and it is going to be probably the larger balances or the oldest will be going first. And we will be out there shutting people off, and they'll have to pay their bill to get their water turned back on, and we want to make sure that we can restore it rather quickly after they pay their bill, but it might take a day or two.

And so the moral of the story here is if you're behind, start paying your bill. You can go online. You can create a payment plan. There is no reason that folks at this point shouldn't be paying their bills. But we will be helping -- we'll incentive them a little bit by turning off their water if they don't pay.

THE COURT: Now, I want the public to be sure to understand that what you are providing here is an estimate on how long it would take to restore.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Because I don't want them to think that they are behind now and then their water gets shut off and it is going to be cut back on two days after you pay, because you have, as you just stated, 11,000 folk who you have to address. And it takes time to replug these folk up.

So then if someone's water is shut off today and they come in and pay the bill tomorrow doesn't mean that by the next day or the next day the water is going to be cut back on.

MR. HENIFIN: We do have goals to try to get them on.

THE COURT: Oh, that's what I'm telling you.

MR. HENIFIN: But as you're clearly explaining, volume, number of people, all those are going to play into that, and we will get it turned on quickly.

THE COURT: As fast as you can.

1 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: But you can't give them a time period of a 3 day or two because you don't know what the work order is 4 going to be. 5 MR. HENIFIN: You're right, Your Honor. THE COURT: And so -- and you don't know how many 6 7 people will be shut off even though you are going to take 8 them in classes or take them in groups. 9 MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: But you don't know how many people at any 10 11 given time will be shut off at the same time for which you 12 will have to go and reconnect them. 13 MR. HENIFIN: Correct. THE COURT: And that is going to take time. 14 15 MR. HENIFIN: And they all get a warning letter. THE COURT: And so it is not going to be a simple 16 matter of pushing a button --17 18 MR. HENIFIN: Right. THE COURT: -- and starting it back up. It has to 19 20 be -- it is more involved than that. And so they just have 2.1 to understand that if they don't want to go through this 22 process of waiting to see how long it is going to take to be 23 reactivated, they better go ahead and pay now. 24 MR. HENIFIN: That is right, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: And not get shut off, because there is no

telling if they get shut off how long it is going to be.

Not to mention that if in the interim we have some other problems that come up that challenge the water company, you know, and so they just better go ahead and pay now.

MR. HENIFIN: Absolutely. If you want to avoid that situation, pay your bill, start paying it, reach out to us and start paying.

THE COURT: Well, there are some people who have been calling around inquiring about that, and unfortunately, there are some people who are ready to call the water company's bluff on that matter, and since it hasn't occurred in the past, they are thinking, well, they still have time, and even if it is shut off, they'll get it cut back on in a day or two, so they just go ahead and take the risk. But this is going to be a much greater risk than they think.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Because it might be some time before that water is cut back on, and they should be advised not to be calling you and asking for expedited treatment, because you can't you give them expedited service. You are going to have so many people to deal with.

MR. HENIFIN: They'll be calling you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, that is also why I am saying this, because I like to keep my telephone calls down, you know. So just because they went to high school with me is not

going to mean anything.

2.1

MR. HENIFIN: That's not going to get them water turned on right away, is it?

THE COURT: It is not going to -- that is not going to cut it back on. So no. So they have to understand they simply have to get their place in line, and it will be cut back on when their turn comes up. And in the meantime, they won't be washing many dishes or they wont be utilizing any water services around their house, won't be taking showers there at their house, but they just have to understand that this is something they brought on themselves with adequate warnings because you even had a flier, I think, at one time that told people that the efforts to cut off water was about to start. Well, it didn't start right then because of these other technical problems. But now --

MR. HENIFIN: We have cut off all of the people -well, close to all of them that didn't have accounts with
us. So we found -- we identified those roughly 2,000
properties that were using water but weren't even in our
system.

THE COURT: That's right.

MR. HENIFIN: You know, you ordered the -- Entergy to turn over their customer information to us. We matched that up with our information and found a number, almost 2,000 properties, that were using electricity but didn't have an

account with the water department.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: That's right. That was the way -- that was the way we got the names.

MR. HENIFIN: That was perfect. And then those folks -- we have cut them off, and they had to go establish service to get their water restored. In most cases, they did exactly that and we didn't hear much from them. were a few that got a little loud and made the news, maybe, but we then find people have established their accounts. That is why we can bill 9.8 million in a given month now, because we have got accurate meter reads, we know who has got accounts, and we need to collect that 9.8 million. Everyone needs to pay their fair share because we need that money to operate the system the way it needs to operate. This isn't just so we can build a big war chest. This is to just get day-to-day operations going and start reinvesting in the system. So it is critical that we get to the point where when we send people a bill, everybody's paying their bill, and we will work our way to get to that point. Most water utilities in the U.S. collect in excess of 99 percent of what they bill, so we've got a long way to go.

THE COURT: Long way.

MR. HENIFIN: But shutting off the water is the big key to making that happen.

THE COURT: For those who missed the connection, when,

Mr. Henifin, you said that -- that the electric company was directed to give us their accounts, that -- the theory was that if a house is receiving electricity, it is habitable and therefore it should be a house that would expect to have water. And then when the accounts didn't match, when there is an electrical account but there is no water account, then we recognize those people were not in the system. And so that was made possible from getting those records from the electric company.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, it was, Your Honor. I appreciate that.

THE COURT: And so, you see, this is how the determination was made that you came up with this specific avenue to get that information, because I know some people might be wondering how did you know who was not getting water, and they might think there's some great big chartboard down to the water company that you can look up every address and just simply see who was not getting water or who is getting water.

But the simplest way is to determine if that house is habitable. If it is getting electricity or if it is getting any other utility service but not getting water service, then it does not take rocket science to recognize that they are not living there without water, so therefore they are simply not paying for it. And that is how those people were

identified.

Well, those were the major violators who weren't even in the system that had been getting water for a long period of time. We were talking not that long ago about some of these people who owe back bills of, what, hundreds of thousands of dollars?

MR. HENIFIN: Those aren't single family.

THE COURT: I know. Not single families, though. No. We had a different conversation on them.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And we are trying to work with some things on that. But, nevertheless, we are talking about some accounts that had hundreds of thousands of dollars in arrears because they essentially had never paid any bills, never paid water bills, basically, and nevertheless had been using volumes and volumes of water through their various endeavors but had not paid any water bills, and now they have been outed, and now they are going be held to task for that. And so that is where we are on that.

MR. HENIFIN: And our billing staff and -- you know, they make those tough calls and negotiate and prod and push to keep us from having to turn people off, but it's -- it's a tough job to be collector, basically, for the water department.

THE COURT: Well, you know my position on that, and I

have talked to you at length about this. My position on this is those serious violators knew they were violating. They knew that they owed the company, they owed the citizenry. They knew that. And so I don't see why they should be afforded much mercy, because they have allowed the rest of the people to support the system that they were bilking the entire time, and they knew they were not paying their fair share or any share, not paying anything at all.

MR. HENIFIN: Correct.

THE COURT: And yet they were consuming far in excess of what the others were utilizing, because a lot of these were companies, et cetera, and so if these folk were out there utilizing the system as they were and taking advantage of the rest of the citizenry, then they ought to be brought to task. So we'll get back to that later, because there might be some other measures that might be in store for people like that.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: It just should not be something we just simply wink and say pay a few dollars here and there and seeing no more.

MR. HENIFIN: Correct.

THE COURT: I mean, they have caused us some serious, serious financial problems, because this system has held on by a thread at times when it didn't have revenues to support

it, and the public didn't even appreciate that, that people not paying the bills, the water company can't run its plant. It needs to pay its people. It needs to buy chemicals. It needs to make repairs. It has all kinds of costs, and these folk who are not paying anything but enjoying what other folk are making possible, there should be something special for them, and so that might come up later on.

MR. HENIFIN: Well, fair warning, you are probably going to see some of those folk try to come in front of you to keep us from collecting. You are going to get your fair share of this whole effort to collect. It's on its way.

THE COURT: Well, I'm looking forward to seeing those folk.

MR. HENIFIN: You'll get to participate actively, I think, in some of those.

THE COURT: Well, I'm looking forward to seeing these folk who want to come in front of this Court saying that they had the wherewithal to pay, chose not to pay, and don't think they had to pay. I have heard all kinds of excuses why people didn't pay. I have heard that various people in high places had low ideas and decided that they just weren't going to pay because they didn't have to. Even some folk who were elected, that they didn't have to, they didn't have to pay. But we'll see.

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.

```
1
            THE COURT: That is something that is on the horizon,
 2
       and then we will see what the people say later on. But I
 3
       can say right now I don't have very much mercy for those
 4
       kinds of people. But go ahead on. Talk to us again.
 5
            MR. HENIFIN: I think that's all I've got, Your Honor.
       It has been plain. So just --
 6
 7
            THE COURT: Well, let's see now. I don't think I had
 8
       anything else. Let me think just for a moment. So let's
 9
       take a recess. All right?
10
            MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor.
11
            THE COURT: Recess for 15 minutes.
12
                         (A recess was taken.)
13
            THE COURT:
                        I don't have any more questions, but I
       might have some after I hear from some other people.
14
15
            And I'll start with the EPA. Hold it. Let me see.
                                                                 We
       have somebody with their hand up.
16
            MS. HILL: Yes, Your Honor. Ayanna Hill, ACLU of
17
18
       Mississippi, representing the intervenor plaintiffs.
19
            Your Honor, I just wanted to make it known that the
20
       intervenor plaintiffs would like to speak on the record
21
       today as well.
22
            THE COURT: Speak about what?
23
            MS. HILL: We would like to raise a couple issues.
24
       of them would be a motion to modify the ISO, amongst other
25
       things.
```

```
1
            THE COURT: Well, that motion -- I didn't think I had
 2
       it down for today.
 3
            Did I, Terri?
            MS. HILL: We have not filed one, Your Honor.
 4
 5
            THE COURT: You need to file it. So you have another
       motion that you have filed?
 6
7
            MS. HILL: We have not. We wanted to orally make the
       motion, if you would --
 8
 9
            THE COURT: Oh, no, I'm not going to take it orally,
       because the parties need an opportunity to respond to it.
10
11
       So then if you have some motions, then go right ahead and
12
       file them, okay? And then after you file them, call the
13
       office and get a time to argue your motions. That is going
       to be after everybody has had a chance to respond to it.
14
15
            So do you have any other motions that have been filed?
            MS. HILL: No, Your Honor. We would just like to raise
16
       other concerns that we have.
17
18
            THE COURT: Well, this is a status conference as to
19
       where we are. And I'm going to have a time period for
20
       concerns, but right now this is a status conference to
21
       determine where we are and what's going on.
22
            MS. HILL: I understand, Your Honor.
23
            THE COURT: Now, let me ask this question: What is
24
       your name?
25
           MS. HILL: Ayanna Hill.
```

```
THE COURT: A-Y-A --
 1
 2
            MR. HILL: A-N-N-A.
 3
            THE COURT: -- N-N-A? Two Ns or one N?
 4
            MS. HILL: Two Ns, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: I was right on top of it, wasn't I?
 5
            MS. HILL: You were. You were. You got it right.
 6
7
       Right on the money.
 8
            THE COURT: Okay. You are with who now?
 9
            MS. HILL: The ACLU of Mississippi.
            THE COURT: And what is your background in this water
10
11
       controversy?
12
            MS. HILL: Yes, Your Honor. So as representatives of
       the intervenor plaintiffs, I represent local counsel, and so
13
       I, along with my cocounsel --
14
15
            THE COURT: You say you represent who?
            MS. HILL: I represent the intervenor plaintiffs as
16
       local counsel.
17
18
            THE COURT: Okay. As local counsel.
19
            MS. HILL: Yes, Your Honor. I misspoke.
20
            THE COURT: And your intervenor plaintiffs, did they
2.1
       have any background in water matters, or are they just
       concerned citizens who --
22
23
            MS. HILL: Concerned citizens.
24
            THE COURT. -- who feel affected by it all.
25
            MS. HILL: Yes, Your Honor.
```

```
1
            THE COURT: Okay. And you yourself, have you followed
 2
       this litigation?
 3
            MS. HILL: Yes.
            THE COURT: So have you read the various orders?
 4
            MS. HILL:
 5
                       Yes.
            THE COURT: What about the consent order? Let's start
 6
7
       you off at the basic, the one that set up this consortium of
 8
       people here. Have you read that?
 9
            MS. HILL: Yes.
            THE COURT: So do you understand the powers that these
10
11
       various people have here and what powers emanate from that
12
       document?
13
            MS. HILL: Yes, sir. I have reviewed the interim
14
       stipulated order as well.
            THE COURT: Okay. So did you review the other orders
15
16
       that came out of this court not that long ago, especially
17
       the one where I gave the public an opportunity to appear
18
       before this Court?
            MS. HILL: Yes, Your Honor.
19
20
            THE COURT: Do you know anything about that?
2.1
            The green light. Press. You got it now?
22
            MS. HILL: I just pressed it on.
23
            THE COURT: Okay then.
24
            MS. HILL: Can you hear me loud and clear now?
25
            THE COURT: You are here. Now, have you gotten a
```

chance to read that? For instance, that might be informative to -- you can talk to the court reporters and order a transcript, because it was transcribed, and you might want to get up to snuff on that, also to see what they said.

Following that proceeding, I wrote some opinions that addressed the concerns of the people who had come here to raise those concerns, and so I wrote an opinion. You would want to read that so that you don't trade over or cover or track over covered ground already, because I responded to some of the folk who came here to offer their comments, criticisms, et cetera, or platitudes, but I went over those matters in that opinion, so you might want to read that too so that you know the kinds of issues that have been covered already and so that when you file your motion and then register your concerns, that you don't find yourself registering concerns which have already been thoroughly covered. But other than that, feel free to file. Okay?

MS. HILL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, then. Thank you.

MS. HILL: Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay, then. Thank you so much.

I saw another hand go up. Did I?

MS. HERNANDEZ: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Would you come forward?

```
1
            And then we will get to the EPA. So just hold your
 2
       comments.
 3
            MS. HERNANDEZ: Your Honor, it's Mikaila Hernandez. We
       are for the plaintiff intervenors.
 4
 5
            We are parties to this case, and we would like to give
       a status update from our parties' side as well. And we were
 6
7
       there at the last conference when you had the public
 8
       commentary as well.
 9
            THE COURT: Okay. You have a status of what?
10
            MS. HERNANDEZ: A status of the community concerns,
11
       because we are parties to this case.
12
            THE COURT: Let me -- hold it. You have a status on
13
       the community concerns?
            MS. HERNANDEZ: Uh-huh. Status update based on the
14
15
       work that the IPTM has done, that the EPA has done, the DOJ
       has done. So --
16
17
            THE COURT: And so this status, is that a report?
18
            MS. HERNANDEZ: There is not a report, but this is a
       status conference.
19
20
            THE COURT: Yes, it is. But do you have a report?
2.1
            MS. HERNANDEZ: Is a report required for a status
22
       conference to participate?
23
            THE COURT: So I take that your answer is no, you don't
24
       have a report.
25
           MS. HERNANDEZ: Does every -- does the EPA have a
```

```
1
       report? Does the City have a report?
 2
            THE COURT: But I'm asking you do you have one?
 3
           MS. HERNANDEZ: We do have a report back, yes.
 4
            THE COURT: And who did your report.
 5
           MS. HERNANDEZ:
                           We did. The community did.
            THE COURT: Who is "we"?
 6
 7
           MS. HERNANDEZ: The community. Plaintiff intervenors.
            THE COURT: The community couldn't have written a
 8
 9
       report together, so who did the report?
            MS. HERNANDEZ: What do you mean, "who did the report"?
10
11
            THE COURT: Is one written?
12
           MS. HERNANDEZ: We have a status update as parties.
13
            THE COURT: I asked you a question. Is it written?
           MS. HERNANDEZ: We don't have a written report.
14
15
            THE COURT: So then the report that you would purport
16
       to give is something that you are giving.
17
           MS. HERNANDEZ: It's something that we are giving
18
       orally, yes.
19
            THE COURT: Okay, then.
20
           MS. HERNANDEZ: At this status conference, yes.
2.1
            THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I want you to give your
       report in writing, and so that when I have my next status
22
23
       conference, I would have had a chance to study it and so
24
      would they, so they'll know then what you're about to say.
25
           MS. HERNANDEZ: Okay. Well, we did inform the Court
```

```
1
       that we would be attending this status conference and
 2
       requested a time to speak.
 3
            THE COURT: Oh, no problem.
            MS. HERNANDEZ: I thought all the parties were giving
 4
 5
       an update on the status.
            THE COURT: But they are in a different situation than
 6
 7
       you're in.
 8
            MS. HERNANDEZ: But we are parties to the case.
 9
            THE COURT: You are arguing with me?
            MS. HERNANDEZ: I'm just saying, Your Honor, that we
10
11
       are --
12
            THE COURT: I said are you arguing with me?
13
            MS. HERNANDEZ: I'm just pushing back on the
       assertion that we don't have a right --
14
15
            THE COURT: Then you are arguing with me, then, aren't
16
       you? Won't you sit down.
17
            MS. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Your Honor.
18
                        Is there anybody else over there who has
            THE COURT:
       court manners who would like to address the Court?
19
20
            MS. SHERMAN: As the plaintiff intervenors?
2.1
            THE COURT: No. I have heard enough from there.
22
       you have a report, put it in writing.
23
            Now then, EPA. My question to you -- first of all, how
24
       are you doing this afternoon?
25
            MR. FINGERHOOD: I'm doing well right now. Thank you,
```

Your Honor.

2.1

THE COURT: You are good. You have been here many times. And you do understand protocol, you know.

Now, my question to you, though, is, from what Mr. Henifin has provided -- and you have been with us the entire time since day one, and so you have heard me go over various aspects of this particular matter -- do you have any update on what he said?

MR. FINGERHOOD: No, Your Honor. For purposes of the status report, we agree that there has been some great progress made. The third-party manager meets regularly with both the EPA and state technical people to discuss the work that he is proposing, the work that he has done, and so I have nothing to report on that. I think they have been working well.

And on the financial side of things too, I know perhaps in the past there have been some conflicts there, but I think even recently those discussions have been going smoothly as well.

THE COURT: There's a second matter. Besides just asking how you are reacting to Mr. Henifin because you have been here with us the entire time and you know what steps we have endured to get to where we are at the present time, but I understand that your agency is holding a conference tonight for community input; is that correct?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes. It's a public comment.

THE COURT: Now, I know that there was a provision for public comment, and we had dealt with that at some time before when you talked about the public comment period before, so we had gone through all of that, and -- and I did have that period for public comment where -- I think I did maybe two of them where we allowed people to come in to make their public comments, and so we did that. We set that aside for them to do. But there's one tonight I was a bit surprised at. This doesn't seem to be a part of the regular protocol for public comment, or am I missing something on that?

MR. FINGERHOOD: No, you're correct, Your Honor. This isn't a formal public comment meeting. I guess maybe an outreach meeting would be a more appropriate title. It's to hear from the community about the progress that has been made to date and any concerns they may have and what they would like to see in the future. It's not a formal proceeding. There won't be any response to comments prepared.

And it is something that we have done in the past too.

I think shortly after the original interim stipulated order,
there was a similar, you know, public outreach session held
in January of that year. I think the actual -- the Deputy
Assistant Attorney General was there, the U.S. Attorney at

the time was there.

And then we also had, I think in March that year, some meetings with smaller groups, business owners, school officials, public health officials, to get some input at that point too. So it has been kind of a process that we have been doing really from shortly after the interim order was entered.

THE COURT: Now, I understood why you wanted the public comment section or experience after this Court first entered this fray and went about issuing some orders on some matters, especially when there was a combination on the water plant along with the sewage and all of that, but under what grant are you marching for this particular public comment? What does it emanate from? What document? What statutory enabling matter, or is this just something that EPA thought would be a good thing to do?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Right. I think there is no legal requirement or regulatory requirement. I think it had been some time since the last kind of outreach meeting had been held, and so it was, you know, thought that it would be a -- it was overdue to kind of hear from the community.

THE COURT: Well, then, I'm further mystified that if you just simply wanted an outreach to determine the status of things, why didn't you ask the Court for a status meeting?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Well, it wasn't -- I mean, we have the -- we wanted to get, I guess, the public's thoughts as far as what they have -- the improvements they have seen, if they have been having any, you know, issues with, you know, not getting notified of -- you know, if there is a boil-water notice associated with some construction work, things like that. Just wanted to hear from the community. This is just feedback that EPA is going to use to -- for its own purposes. And to the extent there are concerns related to either state or the third-party manager, we'll share those with them as we have done in the past.

THE COURT: Well, but as you have done in the past, you had notified the Court that you would like to do that, and I held it here in the courtroom and invited all who were interested to come. So why is this procedure different?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Right. Well, this isn't a formal procedure. It's just an outreach meeting. In the past, for example, when we had the -- the public comment, those were more formal procedures. People mentioned, for example, they had a sewer backup at their home or an overflow, and so we relayed those concerns to the third-party manager and he followed up with those people, and so to the extent we get those types of comments, we will pass them on.

THE COURT: Will you have a stenographer there at this particular session?

1 MR. FINGERHOOD: No. There is no court reporter or 2 anything like that. 3 THE COURT: Will you make a written report on it? MR. FINGERHOOD: We -- this is, like I said, for, you 4 5 know, EPA's internal purposes. We don't plan on issuing any report or anything like that. 6 7 THE COURT: So there will not be a public assessment of 8 the meeting? 9 MR. FINGERHOOD: Right. I mean, it is open to the 10 public. 11 I understand open to the public, but as far 12 as drawing any conclusions from what is stated during the course of those proceedings, will there be a record of that? 13 MR. FINGERHOOD: No, no official record. 14 15 THE COURT: Will there be any potential adverse consequences flowing from that? 16 17 MR. FINGERHOOD: I'm not sure what you're referring to. 18 THE COURT: Well, EPA is going to conduct this, and I would imagine that EPA is going to either take notes or 19 20 record. So are you going to do either one of those? 2.1 MR. FINGERHOOD: I'm sure people may take notes, but 22 there is no official note-taker, no recording that is going 23 to be prepared. If somebody has a concern, you know, that 24 we think maybe the State might know the answer to or it is 25 something that the third-party manager could address, then,

1 you know, we'll pass that on to them as we have done in the 2 past. 3 THE COURT: So there will be an open microphone there? MR. FINGERHOOD: Correct. 4 THE COURT: So then will you be taking the names of 5 people who approach the microphone? 6 7 MR. FINGERHOOD: Yeah, not specifically. If they want 8 to give their names. I mean, especially if they want some 9 sort of follow-up if they have a specific issue. THE COURT: Now, I don't understand that answer. 10 11 you are saying that people can approach the microphone and 12 potentially complain but are not required to give their names or addresses? 13 MR. FINGERHOOD: I think that's -- that's the case, but 14 15 if they would want someone to try and follow up on that, then I think someone would ask, you know, can we get your 16 name and contact information? 17 18 THE COURT: Well, how would you expect such a program to be valuable when you can't determine the veracity of the 19 20 persons who are appearing before you? If you don't even 2.1 know their names or addresses, how can you determine that 22 they are really being truthful with what they are saying or 23 they're having the experience they say they are saying --24 they are experiencing?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Well, I mean, it's not an evidentiary

25

```
1
       proceeding. It is just an opportunity for people to say
 2
       things, and if people want to say things that -- you know,
 3
       what's on their minds, you know, it's not an evidentiary
 4
       hearing.
 5
            THE COURT: So you are not going to even verify whether
       these persons own a piece of property or are renting in
 6
 7
       Jackson?
            MR. FINGERHOOD: It is open to the public, so --
 8
 9
            THE COURT: Anybody who wants to get up and just say
       something?
10
11
            MR. FINGERHOOD: Right.
12
            THE COURT: No matter whether that person is a citizen
13
       of Jackson, a homeowner in Jackson, a renter in Jackson, or
       just a trucker going through Jackson, you are just saying
14
15
       that it doesn't matter?
            MR. FINGERHOOD: Right. They can come in and voice
16
17
       their opinion. And obviously if they have a specific
18
       concern or they make some sort of claim that they want to be
       followed up on, then we would, you know, ask if they want to
19
20
       give their name and number and whatever contact information.
2.1
       If they don't, then, you know --
            THE COURT: And who will be the moderator?
22
23
            MR. FINGERHOOD: It will be Assistant U.S. Attorney
24
       Mitzi Paige.
25
            THE COURT: And so she will be moderating this
```

discussion.

2.1

MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And I suppose as moderator she will have some powers of moderation, like finding out who is talking?

MR. FINGERHOOD: I don't think that would be an opening question. I think -- as Your Honor said, I think it is going to be an open mic type of situation. Someone will raise their hand and, you know, someone will bring a microphone to them.

THE COURT: I never heard of a proceeding like that.

Is this an official proceeding?

MR. FINGERHOOD: No, it is not an official --

THE COURT: So this is -- this is nonofficial.

MR. FINGERHOOD: Right. It is for EPA's own and DOJ's own purposes just to hear from the community. There is no recording. In our past meetings, we have -- we have really only had concerned people from Jackson show up. We haven't had by-passers come in. And for the public comment period, it was a more formalized process where we did have a court reporter and we did prepare a transcript and did have people give their, you know, names and contact information, but this is not that type of process. It is supposed to be informal, and it is an opportunity to hear from the community.

THE COURT: What code section authorizes this? I have

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

never heard of this before in this informal context with these loose procedural indicators of anybody who can get up and say anything without any aspect of being tied to what they were saying or involved in what they were saying, and I have just never heard of a setting like this. So what is the regulatory pronouncement for this? MR. FINGERHOOD: I don't believe there is a regulation that establishes this. It's just, you know, as the regulatory agency, EPA wants to hear from the public, and if there are, like I said, specific concerns or claims that are made, then, you know, we can ask for people to provide their information, but they -- we're not requiring it and we're not, you know, having people verify their address when they come in. It is just an open listening session. THE COURT: Do you expect the press to be there? MR. FINGERHOOD: I do think that there will likely be some press that show up. THE COURT: Did you invite the press? Not you personally but your agency, your agents, did you invite the press? MR. FINGERHOOD: I don't think they were specifically invited, but I think we did reach out to them to publicize. THE COURT: So you notified them? MR. FINGERHOOD: Yeah, we did notify them.

THE COURT: And what did you notify them of?

```
1
            MR. FINGERHOOD: That, you know, we were having these
 2
       outreach meetings, the date, the location, the times.
 3
            THE COURT: And this notification gave all the
       appearance of an official proceeding?
 4
 5
            MR. FINGERHOOD:
            THE COURT: Your notification didn't say that this is
 6
7
       thoroughly unofficial?
 8
            MR. FINGERHOOD: No. It said it's just a public
 9
       outreach.
            THE COURT: Put on by the EPA.
10
11
            MR. FINGERHOOD: EPA and DOJ.
            THE COURT: So it gives people the impression that it
12
13
       is a formalized proceeding.
            MR. FINGERHOOD: Well, no, not a -- it is us wanting to
14
15
       hear from the community. It's not a --
            THE COURT: But you don't know if you're hearing from
16
17
       the community. You said you don't know where these people
18
       will be coming from.
19
            MR. FINGERHOOD: Right.
20
            THE COURT: So how do you know you are hearing from the
21
       community?
22
            MR. FINGERHOOD: Well, we are hearing from people who
23
       want to come up to the microphone. We will have sign-in
24
       sheets, so if people do want to sign in, they can.
25
            THE COURT: But if they don't want to sign in, they
```

1 don't have to. 2 MR. FINGERHOOD: Right. 3 THE COURT: And so, then, how do you know, then, that the majority of your attendees won't be just political 4 5 hacks? How do you know that? You can't know that, can you? MR. FINGERHOOD: No, I don't know that. 6 7 THE COURT: So, then, you don't know what motive these 8 people might have or, for that matter, as I said before, 9 whether they have a water issue at all. MR. FINGERHOOD: That's correct. 10 11 THE COURT: I just never heard of that. 12 MR. FINGERHOOD: I think it is actually somewhat, 13 common, Your Honor, not just for EPA but across the 14 government, especially, you know, more recently that the 15 regulators want to hear from the communities that they are working with. So it's not a formal process and there is no 16 17 kind of regulatory basis for it, and there is no, I guess, 18 required outcome either. We -- we would like to hear from 19 them and, you know, they may have specific concerns; they 20 may have general concerns; they may have praise. And so 2.1 we're -- we just want to hear whatever they have to say. 22 THE COURT: So how much publicity did you submit on 23 this matter? I didn't hear about it until the other day.

So how long has your publicity machinery been operating?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Well, I don't know if we have a

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

publicity machinery, but there are some, you know, public affairs people at EPA, and I think they sent out emails to people who had attended past meetings. Also, you know, the local TV networks, radio stations, you know, they got a, you know, notification and request to, you know, let the public know. THE COURT: When is the last time you had such a meeting anywhere in the country? MR. FINGERHOOD: Well, I know specifically in Jackson, we had one in March, I guess following the --THE COURT: Well, you know, I know about the ones that were held in three different venues here. MR. FINGERHOOD: Right. THE COURT: But that had a different procedural background. And not only had a different procedural background, but the Court was notified on all three of those. MR. FINGERHOOD: Right. THE COURT: Unlike this one. The Court was not notified formally, was it? MR. FINGERHOOD: Right. Well, we did provide a letter to the Court in advance. THE COURT: After you had -- not in advance. You mean after you had planned it. MR. FINGERHOOD: Yeah. But before it was publicized.

```
1
       But the -- you know, it is not that unheard of. In fact,
 2
       you know, the third-party manager has quarterly, you know,
 3
       meetings where the public can come in. He also has -- I
       mean, I think this is something that is done, you know, in
 4
       all different situations, especially more recently where,
 5
       you know, the regulator would like to hear from the
 6
 7
       community.
            THE COURT: What about Mr. Henifin? Was he informed?
 8
 9
           MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes, he was informed. As was the City
       and the State and the intervenors. So we did let them know.
10
11
            THE COURT: Do you have your public announcement? Do
12
       you have that with you?
           MR. FINGERHOOD: We have -- yeah, we have a -- is that
13
14
       the press release?
15
            THE COURT: Yes, press release will do. Could you read
       it into the record?
16
17
            MR. FINGERHOOD: It is -- I can also submit a copy, but
18
       I'm also happy to read it into the record.
19
            THE COURT: Okay. I'll take the hard copy for the
20
       record, but could you go ahead and read that into the
2.1
       record?
22
            MR. FINGERHOOD: Sure. "Community input needed for
       City of Jackson drinking water system.
23
24
            "September 26, 2024.
25
            "Contact Information EPA Region 4 Press Office.
```

"404-562-8400.

"Jackson, Mississippi. (September 26, 2024) - the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and U.S. Department of Justice will hold public meetings to get community input on mid- and long-term solutions to improve Jackson's drinking water system. This feedback will assist the agency's oversight of the drinking water system. The meetings will be held at the Mississippi e-Center at Jackson State University located at 1230 Raymond Road. The meetings will be held on Thursday, October 10th at 6 p.m. Central Standard Time in the e-Logistics Room and Friday, October 11th at 10 a.m. Central Standard Time in the California Room.

"The EPA and DOJ have heard from the public in previous meetings, letters, emails, and phone calls concerning the future of the drinking water system. In the upcoming meetings, the EPA and DOJ are seeking additional community input on the future of the system.

"Background.

"On November 29, 2022, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi" -- that would be Your Honor -- "entered an Interim Stipulated Order (ISO), agreed to by the EPA, the Department of Justice, the Mississippi State Department of Health, and the City of Jackson to: (1) create a Priority Projects List with steps needed to stabilize the City's drinking water system, remedy

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

problems that contributed to the water crisis, and establish sustainable practices; (2) appoint Edward 'Ted' Henifin as the Interim Third-Party Manager (ITPM) to manage the City's drinking water system and implement the Prior Projects List; and (3) delay further litigation while the Parties (EPA, MSDH, DOJ, and the City) worked on a longer-term solution. "In addition to hearing from the community at the meetings, we have created an email box to gather your input. Comments can also be sent to JacksonMSWater@epa.gov until Friday October 31, 2024. "The EPA and DOJ cannot discuss details of negotiations with the City or MSDH about this civil enforcement action. "For more information, please visit www.epa.gov/ms/jackson-ms-drinking-water." And that's it. It has some language if you need assistance for different languages. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. If you would make that copy available to my courtroom department here, I would appreciate it. Do you want to take that note up from your brain trust first? MR. FINGERHOOD: I will when I return.

THE COURT: Thank you. Now -- let me see it. Who came up with the catchy title, "Community input needed for City of Jackson drinking water system"?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Someone in the EPA public affairs

office.

THE COURT: Okay. And then whose idea was this -- this whole matter right here and decision not to go through the Court, for instance? Whose decision was that?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Well, I think it's something, as I said, that has been done in other cases and not just -- you know, not just cases but other issues where the regulator wants to hear from the community. I think it's kind of a, you know, principle of good government that you want to hear from the constituents. I think, like I said, it is not going to be transcribed, and perhaps that's a setting that might make people feel more comfortable to say what they have to say. And as Your Honor says maybe, you know, we -- it is not going be verified. They are not under oath. And it's just to hear from the community, and it's, you know, something that I think is being done more and more when the government is involved in, you know, taking certain regulatory actions.

THE COURT: So then it says here on the background that this stipulated order was entered, "agreed to by the EPA, the Department of Justice, the Mississippi State Department of Health, and the City of Jackson (1) to create a Priority Projects List with steps needed to stabilize the City's drinking water system, remedy problem that contributed to the water crisis, and establish sustainable practices."

That was part of the stipulated order, correct.

MR. FINGERHOOD: Correct.

2.1

THE COURT: Do you think that in large part this has been done?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes. In fact, we just heard a status report as far as the progress that has been made, and, you know, there are still things that need to be done, and those are, you know, being done, and there has been consultation between, you know, the third-party manager and the State and EPA on -- on all those technical issues, and that's why I said at the beginning of our remarks I didn't have anything to add to the third-party manager's update.

THE COURT: Okay. And then number two: "appoint Edward 'Ted' Henifin as the Interim Third-Party Manager to manage the City's drinking water system and implement the Priority Protects List."

Are you of the opinion that he has done a good job in doing these things?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes. I think I said that earlier, that he has been giving the status reports and he has been coordinating with both the State and EPA on, you know, what he has been doing, what he is planning on doing, and I have heard no concerns from my client on -- as far as the work that is being done on the priority projects list and the updates he has been giving to the Court and the regulators.

2.1

THE COURT: This Court has been tasked with oversighting these matters. Are there some matters that the EPA feels that the Court could be stronger in providing its oversight in as opposed to what it has done thus far?

MR. FINGERHOOD: No, Your Honor. And if we did feel that way, we would bring an appropriate pleading and ask Your Honor to do that, but, you know, we haven't filed any such pleading.

THE COURT: And then the last one on here: "delay further litigation while the parties (EPA, MSDH, DOJ, and the City) work on a long-term solution."

Now, isn't that what is being done now under Henifin, trying to determine a long-term solution? But before we get to a long-term solution, we have to address the short-term problems to put ourselves on an even keel to even think about the long term. And do you agree with that since there are some issues that still need to be resolved?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes, sir. There is still work to be done even on the priority project list.

THE COURT: We still can't get to the financial stability that we need to be at because people are not paying their bills and are not even on the rolls. So we still have all those things to consider and to address. And then, of course, this matter of a long-term solution. Do you have one in mind that — that is precious to you?

2.1

MR. FINGERHOOD: No, I don't, Your Honor. I do want to, I guess, maybe take a step back. You know, when we first negotiated the interim stipulated order, we didn't know about any of this money that was going to come from Congress. We were trying to figure out what we could do with the money that the City had and the revenue it was bringing in at the time, and Mr. Henifin agreed to kind of take the position under those circumstances.

You know, it was fortunate that Congress saw fit to provide that money. I think everybody would say -- I don't think it is controversial -- that that money, even though it is a terrific amount and has helped make tremendous progress, it is not enough to address all of the concerns that need to be met, especially when you factor in the sewer system, because none of that money can be used towards the sewer. All of the money from Congress primarily -- well, has to go either to capital improvement projects or the small portion that can be used for O and M.

THE COURT: I think I asked this question before on one of our previous occasions, but I'll ask it again: Have you ever taken a tour of Jackson to see firsthand its particular water problems and sewage problems?

MR. FINGERHOOD: I was on a small tour with Your Honor and $\ensuremath{\mathsf{--}}$

THE COURT: That's the first time. And that was way

2.1

some time ago. But since then, have you taken one?

MR. FINGERHOOD: I have been in Jackson many times, and I have seen a lot of the infrastructure problems, the sewer overflows, and, you know, I'm also aware of them through, you know, our engineers, who meet frequently with the City and the State and Mr. Henifin, and they are all also aware of the progress that has been made since the interim order has been --

THE COURT: Was there ever a time you didn't trust drinking Jackson's water?

MR. FINGERHOOD: I always drank the water and --

THE COURT: Did you always trust it?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Yeah. I'm not a bottled water person personally, and, you know, there are certain other issues with, you know, bottles and all of that other stuff too, so I have always -- I use tap water.

THE COURT: So then --

MR. FINGERHOOD: But I don't live in Jackson and I haven't experienced the issues that the people who live here do. That is one of the reasons that we like to hear from the community. I know Your Honor has personally experienced many of these things. Some of the people I work with -- AUSA Paige has experienced a number of these issues as well as some of the, you know, state and -- engineers who, you know, have been working on this case. So, you know, I know

this has been a long-running problem.

2.1

THE COURT: But you have seen the reports that say that the water here is safe.

MR. FINGERHOOD: I haven't seen the Yale report, but I have seen --

THE COURT: Well, that just happened.

MR. FINGERHOOD: Right. I have seen the EPA and the state reports about the -- you know, the water quality and also the recent PFA testing, which I think that rule actually has been finalized now, so there is an official limit on what can be in the water. And as Mr. Henifin accurately reported, Jackson's levels are way below that threshold.

THE COURT: Yeah. So far, these reports have been quite -- quite glowing towards Jackson. They show what Jackson has become as opposed to where it was. Of course, you know all that, though, because weren't you with Jackson and this crisis years and years and years ago?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes, Your Honor. I was one of the original people who worked on the sewer consent decree.

THE COURT: That's right. And that was a long time ago. And so, then, you then have firsthand knowledge; that is, from your filings and from your monitoring of Jackson's drinking and sewage problems for many years.

Would you say -- and if it puts you on the -- you know,

on the hook, just let me know, but would you say that

Jackson has improved drastically in the last couple of years

or so?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Yeah. I mean, I -- I don't think, you know, you need to take my word for it, but, you know, the reports are filed with the Court that show that, you know, there has been progress made, there has been water testing on the sewer side, there have been reports filed with MDEQ, so I think people can look and see that information is out there.

THE COURT: Well, I ask these questions because I would hate for the public to get the impression from this flier that you all suspect that Jackson is not doing well, but that is not what this flier is about, though, is it?

MR. FINGERHOOD: It's just to hear from the public both positive and negative. And as the third-party manager reported, when we did have the public comment period, the official public comment period, on the sewer stipulated order, the feedback was overwhelmingly positive.

THE COURT: Exactly. So I just wanted to be clear that this public service announcement is not the result of some criticism of Mr. Henifin's work at this point?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Correct. It's an opportunity to hear from the public.

THE COURT: It is just an opportunity for the public,

whoever they might be, to weigh in on what they think about the matter. But, of course, we recognize that much of the public does not really understand all of the issues that are here involved, only a portion; that is, what affects them directly, as to whether their house is flooded or whether their house does not have any water.

But, of course, Mr. Henifin and his crew are open to those telephone calls to come in to tell them that so that it can get started immediately what they have been doing, but that this flier and that this meeting, they are not the product of some criticism from EPA or from the Justice Department where they are -- where you all are investigating the City and its problems as though it needs more than a Band-Aid.

MR. FINGERHOOD: No, that's -- that's -- you have said it correctly. There is no investigation. We just want to hear from the public positive, negative. Just want to hear what they have to say, you know, get their thoughts.

THE COURT: Okay. But I still repeat that I'm surprised that the EPA would be anchoring a proceeding which is guaranteed to, from what I have heard so far, present people of unidentified identities, unidentified names, addresses, and legitimacy as to what they are talking about. These folk just simply might be folk who, for some reason, don't like the consent decree or might be some people who

just don't like the Court's involvement vis the involvement and the control of the City or might be some people who just don't like our third-party interim manager. And I can't for the life of me under this procedure that you are proposing, see how that's supposed to be helpful when you will not know the integrity, will not know the legitimacy of the comments. I don't guite understand that.

Everybody who appeared before me at my last status conference I allowed to come to the microphone, state his/her name, address, connection so that anyone who wanted to know if they had a legitimate gripe could investigate what they said and understand from whence they are coming. But under the procedure you just explained, anybody could show up. Like I said, it could be a passing truck driver who drives interstate, just stopped at the meeting because it looked interesting and come in and start making complaints about water which might actually emanate from his hometown in Flint, Michigan.

So we have no idea where these people might be coming from and what they might be saying, and yet two reputable agencies are inviting them to come out to allegedly provide input that's supposed to be helpful. I don't understand how you can even say that's helpful. But nevertheless, that is what you have chosen to do, and so I'll go with that.

So let me see what I have here. Hold on just for a

second.

2.1

Oh, yeah. There was one other matter. This -- let's see. There was a note. It's not on this document. It's on another one. I'm asking about a letter from the mayor's office that went to the EPA administration that I have a copy of here. This letter is dated March 27, 2024. And in this letter were some criticisms of the third-party manager, Mr. Henifin. Are you familiar with that letter?

MR. FINGERHOOD: I believe I have seen a copy of it.

THE COURT: Well, I ask because this letter has a number of items in it that this Court took up at its last status conference, and you were at that last status conference where I expressed my displeasure to some of the people who appeared at the podium there to make their complaints about what had been ongoing. Some of those complaints were ridiculous, but nevertheless, I wrote an opinion, a response, later as to those. In fact, I pointed out how a number of persons simply had some misinformed ideas and even some racist ideas, and so I pointed all of that out in my public response to those people who had chosen to address the City on their comments which were not informed.

But my question is: Since this letter is dated back in March 27, '24, do you know whether your agency was anywise motivated to have these conferences that we are now talking

```
1
       about by that last status conference and some of those
 2
       comments that were made there and by this office -- in this
 3
       letter from the mayor's office?
            MR. FINGERHOOD: No, I'm not sure if the letter was
 4
 5
       actually filed with the Court. I do recall seeing that,
 6
       but, no --
 7
            THE COURT: But you did read the letter?
 8
            MR. FINGERHOOD: -- I have no knowledge of that.
 9
            THE COURT: But you did read the letter?
10
            MR. FINGERHOOD: Oh, yeah. I think EPA may have
11
       responded to it.
12
            THE COURT: Yeah. You saw my response.
            MR. FINGERHOOD: I think EPA issued a --
13
            THE COURT: Huh?
14
15
           MR. FINGERHOOD: I think EPA responded as well.
            THE COURT: And what did you think about my response
16
17
       when I criticized some of those persons who had appeared
18
       before this Court for their racist comments where they said
19
       that their problem with Mr. Henifin was that he was white
20
       and that he was also from out of state? What did you think
2.1
       about that?
22
            MR. FINGERHOOD: I have no position on that, Your
23
       Honor.
24
            THE COURT: You think it might be right?
25
           MR. FINGERHOOD: I have no position on that.
```

```
1
            THE COURT: Well, do you agree with it? Do you think
 2
       that is a valid criticism? I'm putting you on the line
 3
       here. You represent EPA here, and I'd like to know what
 4
       EPA's position is here.
 5
            MR. FINGERHOOD: I don't think EPA has any official
       position on that.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: Do you think EPA is racist?
 8
            MR. FINGERHOOD: I -- I have not seen that in my
 9
       experience.
            THE COURT: So, then, EPA would be against any racist
10
11
       comments, then, wouldn't they?
12
            MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes, I think --
13
            THE COURT: Or do you think that EPA harbors some race
14
       against Jacksonians?
15
            MR. FINGERHOOD: No, I don't think that.
16
            THE COURT: So, then, you would agree with me, then
17
       that if those comments that I emphasize and isolated were
18
       racist, then you would agree that EPA would be against those
       comments, wouldn't you?
19
20
           MR. FINGERHOOD: (Inaudible).
2.1
            THE COURT REPORTER: Can you repeat that?
22
            THE COURT: He said EPA does not take any position on
23
       that.
24
            Is that correct?
25
           MR. FINGERHOOD: I think there was a transcript, and
```

```
people can look at the transcript and read Your Honor's
 1
 2
       opinion and --
 3
            THE COURT: But you can read it too, though, can't you?
            MR. FINGERHOOD: I can, but my --
 4
 5
            THE COURT: And you then have a -- you then have a
       notion of what racism is, don't you?
 6
 7
            MR. FINGERHOOD: My own personal opinions are not
       before this Court.
 8
 9
            THE COURT: Okay. So EPA -- but you speak --
10
            MR. FINGERHOOD: EPA and DOJ have not taken any --
11
            THE COURT: But you speak for them right now, though,
12
       don't you?
13
            MR. FINGERHOOD: On -- on the matters that are, you
       know, being litigated before the Court.
14
15
            THE COURT: Well, I mean, you don't think that matter
       was being litigated here in court about criticisms against
16
17
       what was taken place? You don't think that is official?
18
            MR. FINGERHOOD: There has been criticism. There has
       been praise. There have been both. And I'm here to follow
19
20
       the law and argue on behalf of the United States and EPA.
2.1
            THE COURT: Well, I'm just trying to determine why did
22
       you come to hold what is, in my estimation, an unusual
23
       session after you have received a letter from the mayor.
24
            MR. FINGERHOOD: Yeah. This public meeting is not
25
       motivated in any fashion by the mayor's letter. We are just
```

2.1

trying to hear from the public. If it would be helpful, I could provide this Court with a list of EPA outreach meetings that they have held on various matters, you know, in the past year and you can see that it's widespread not just through EPA but throughout other federal agencies as well.

THE COURT: Was this letter taken into account at all in your decision to hold these ad hoc meetings?

MR. FINGERHOOD: To my knowledge, no.

THE COURT: Let me ask you more directly. Is this letter from the mayor some sort of foundation for the EPA and Justice Department taking a contrary view of the progress that is being made in Jackson under Ted Henifin?

MR. FINGERHOOD: No. I mean, I think we have been clear on the record today at the status report that we were pleased with the progress that has been made.

THE COURT: Well, I just wanted to know whether there is some effort to try and undermine that progress, because for years, you know, we had no progress. In fact, we had nothing. And so I was making sure that this letter here was not some foundation for you all coming in here to advise the public that, quote, "Community input needed for City of Jackson drinking water system," because that is the heading on this matter. It could give a different impression to someone that the EPA, the powerful Environmental Protection

Agency, and the Justice Department are coming here to investigate what has been going on down here. But you didn't come for that, though, did you?

MR. FINGERHOOD: No. We just came to hear from the public.

THE COURT: So there is no investigatory effort expect to be expended on this matter, is it?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Not that I'm aware of. This is to -a public meeting for people to, you know, hear from the
public. You know, they may have good things to say; they
may have complaints. And maybe to the extent, like I said
before, you know, people had a backup in their home, so we
let the third-party manager know about that, and I think he
responded to those fairly quickly. So they may hear some of
that tonight too. And we will, of course, again, pass those
on to his --

THE COURT: Your brain trust has another note for you.

MR. FINGERHOOD: Also, when we had the prior meetings

too, we promised the community that, you know, we wouldn't just kind of come in once, hear from them, and never hear from them again. So we also did say, you know, we will be back to hear from you at some point in the future. So this is some point in the future.

There may be, even further down the line, additional outreach meetings. We will make sure we give the Court

```
1
       advance notice of any such future ones. But it's a process
 2
       that EPA and other agencies have been doing more so recently
 3
       in the last few years.
            THE COURT: Okay. Well, you have something you want to
 4
            I have asked you a lot of questions, and I don't to
 5
 6
       shortchange your responses. So if you have something you
7
       want to say, you can talk to your brain trust over there for
       a moment and see if there is something that you should close
 8
 9
       out with. Okay? So go right ahead.
            MR. FINGERHOOD: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.
10
11
            THE COURT: Okay.
12
            MR. FINGERHOOD: The brain trust has nothing further,
       Your Honor.
13
            THE COURT: Are you all sure?
14
15
           Ms. Williams, are you all sure that you don't have
16
       anything?
            MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, Your Honor, we are.
17
18
            THE COURT: If you all have another note for him, go
       ahead and give it to him now.
19
20
            MS. WILLIAMS: We would if we did, Your Honor, but we
21
       don't. We appreciate your graciousness, though.
22
            THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
23
            And, Ms. Paige, I assume that both of you all were
24
       acting together?
25
           MS. PAIGE: Yes, Your Honor. She speaks for me as
```

well.

2.1

THE COURT: Okay, then. Thank you very much. You got two able people sitting next to you.

MR. FINGERHOOD: Very fortunate.

THE COURT: All right, then. Now, of my original plaintiffs and defendants, I want to hear from you on the status.

And so now, Mr. Henifin, is there something else you want to add?

MR. HENIFIN: There is. I hate to go there.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. HENIFIN: I think this horse has been beaten, but I'll continue to whip it.

So on this meeting tonight, the flier that was sent that was delivered to me, had a link at the bottom: "For more information." When you clink on that link, it takes you to the EPA website. Last paragraph of the EPA website says, "The EPA and DOJ have heard from the public in previous meeting, letters, emails, and phone calls about what matters to you concerning the future of the drinking water system. This has included a desire to hire from within the community and use local contractors, requests for increased transparency and information, the importance of ensuring accountability and equity, and the importance of having a voice about the future of the system. Through

2.1

these meetings, the EPA and DOJ are hoping to receive input on several different items where your voice could have an impact."

Take you back to the letter from May 27th (sic) you were referring to. Mayor highlights five issues. Four of those issues are listed in that same area: the use of local contractors and hiring from within is the "Lack of Competitive Procurement," number 1 in the mayor's letter.

"Insufficient Communication and Coordination" would line right up with "transparency and information."

"Uncertainty in Financial Planning" is the "accountability and equity."

And finally, the improper support of the legislation that was proposed was the voice in the future of the system.

So I would believe that somehow this letter is linked to this meeting.

THE COURT: Well, let's go back to the EPA. You all just happened to utilize the same four out of five factors that the mayor's letter included?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Those are concerns that were raised by the public, and I think the third-party manager has been -- has made efforts to accommodate those. For example, when we did negotiate the stipulated order, he now has quarterly public meetings. He also started the JXN Water Academy, which allows people to learn about the drinking water

system.

So we have, you know, spoken with him about these concerns, and he has taken steps to incorporate those. He has on his website, you know, list transparency about, you know, the local contractors he has used and the minority business enterprises that he has been contracting with.

Now, as he explains, and this is a valid point, you know, Jacobs Engineering that runs the plant is a large national, maybe international, firm, and so they hire people from all over, and, you know, financially that's where most of the money goes. There's a national shortage of qualified water engineers. That is one of the reasons, you know, the system got to be where it was. And so -- but it's all been -- there is transparency now. He has been posting this information.

There are -- people commented about, well, where is the money going? He has a tracker on his website that you can go and see, you know, where the money -- and it has pie charts and things.

So there are things that were raised, and we mentioned them to him, and he has taken steps to -- to try and incorporate those into both his website and, you know, notices. And, you know, he now has, you know, public relations or public affairs people who help also kind of reach out and kind of let the public know what is being

```
1
       done.
 2
            So that's all I have to say.
 3
            THE COURT: So you are telling me that the mayor's
       letter which mentioned these in particular and these same
 4
 5
       factors ended up being in your notice are just a
 6
       coincidence?
 7
            MR. FINGERHOOD: It is the same issues that have been
 8
       raised.
 9
            THE COURT: You are saying it is a coincidence and that
       you were not influenced by the mayor's letter?
10
11
            MR. FINGERHOOD: No, I don't believe that to be the
12
       case.
13
            THE COURT: Well, then who wrote that flier?
            MR. FINGERHOOD: Huh?
14
            THE COURT: Who wrote the flier?
15
            MR. FINGERHOOD: Someone at the EPA public relations.
16
17
            THE COURT: And it just happened to identify the same
18
       four out of five factors that the mayor said in almost the
19
       same language?
20
            MR. FINGERHOOD: I don't know. I can't speak to what
21
       the mayor wrote or where he got those factors.
22
            THE COURT: Well, you have the mayor's letter, don't
23
       you? And you had a flier.
24
            MR. FINGERHOOD: I have seen it, yeah.
25
            THE COURT: Well, can you just compare those just for a
```

second and tell me if that was just a coincidence?

MR. FINGERHOOD: To my knowledge, I think those are the things that have been raised in the public, both before the letter -- I don't think those are things that, you know -- wasn't any specific thing. I think, you know, we have probably mentioned those to the third-party manager in the past, and that, I think, is why he, you know, has made some of the things -- you know, I don't where the mayor --

THE COURT: You know, that transparency matter was something that the group that came in front of me last time constantly talked about, but yet when I asked them what they meant by "transparency," apparently they didn't have a dictionary to look that word up, because they didn't know. And so I had asked them what was not transparent.

Just a few moments ago, you gave all the -- not all, but you gave various matters where our third-party manager has endeavored to be just that: transparent. So, then, why is that one of the matters you want to investigate when you just said that there has been so much progress in that area?

MR. FINGERHOOD: I didn't say, Your Honor -- with all due respect, I don't think we said we are investigating anything.

THE COURT: Well, it is --

MR. FINGERHOOD: We want to hear from the public.

THE COURT: It says "Community input needed," and then

Mr. Henifin read that footnote. So did you not read the footnote in your own flier?

Mr. Henifin, was that a footnote in that flier?

MR. HENIFIN: Yes, Your Honor. It was -- the flier

that they prepared had a "For more information," go to this

link, and that is where I went to and found the information

I just relayed.

THE COURT: I see.

2.1

MR. FINGERHOOD: I mean, I -- those are concerns we have heard for, you know, some time, and, as I said, we have relayed those to Mr. Henifin, and he has made efforts to address those. We have heard that, you know, beginning back in -- I think it was March of 2023, when we had meetings with some of the smaller groups, the schools, the hospitals, the business leaders, so I don't think it was something new. I don't think it was related to the letter from the mayor.

THE COURT: Sounds rather suspicious, doesn't it?

MR. FINGERHOOD: I -- I mean, I think these have been,
you know, out there in the press and people have been saying
these things, and, you know, there have been -- we have
relayed them. And, you know, you mentioned the -- the
hearing. I think that may have preceded some of these
changes that were made to the sewer stipulated order and
also some of the additions to the website that, you know,
Mr. Henifin and JXN Water have made to include a lot more

information. And, you know, there is -- you know, he has the 24-hour hotline too. I think a lot of efforts have been made to address the concerns.

Now, I'm sure people still may have some concerns, and we'll hear what they are and we'll -- to the extent they relate to, you know, what EPA is doing, what the State is doing, what the third-party manager is doing, we'll pass those along as well.

THE COURT: I want to be sure about this last point, and then we'll finish. You are speaking on behalf of EPA, aren't you?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes. EPA is my client.

THE COURT: And so you are speaking on EPA's behalf.

MR. FINGERHOOD: Correct.

THE COURT: So the answers you have provided here are answers that are binding EPA as to what EPA's mission is here and EPA's recognition of what has been accomplished here?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Correct. We have -- I have stated EPA's position on the status report, and the public outreach meetings are merely just to hear from the public.

THE COURT: And EPA is committed to assisting this project, to assisting this Court, to assisting Mr. Henifin, to assisting the water industry, and to assisting the sewage, you know, efforts to ensure that the citizenry of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Jackson are getting what they should get as citizens of this city, and so EPA is not interested in working against those interests, is it? MR. FINGERHOOD: No, Your Honor. Our interest is ensuring that the laws with respect to safe drinking water and the laws related to clean water are complied with both here in Jackson as they are everywhere else in the United States. THE COURT: So EPA and Justice are committed to handling this matter in a justiciable manner to be fair to the citizens of Jackson and not to, for instance, the mayor's administration? MR. FINGERHOOD: No. Our obligation is to the citizens of the United States and the people of Jackson. THE COURT: Citizens of Jackson. I also threw in the "citizens of Jackson." MR. FINGERHOOD: And the citizens of Jackson to ensure that the laws applying to safe drinking water and clean water are applied to them just as they are everywhere else in the country. THE COURT: So you do not see your agency as being a tool of city government here? MR. FINGERHOOD: No. We are here to work with the -to enforce the federal laws.

THE COURT: No matter where they fall? No matter --

1 MR. FINGERHOOD: Right. Right. 2 THE COURT: Whether they fall --3 MR. FINGERHOOD: I guess Your Honor knows we had a 4 disagreement over what the law provided with respect to SNAP recipients' information. 5 THE COURT: That's right. 6 7 MR. FINGERHOOD: And I know you didn't like my position 8 there, but I felt that that was the position of -- that was 9 provided for in the statute, and you disagreed with me and issued an order. 10 11 THE COURT: Well, I understand --12 MR. FINGERHOOD: So that happens, but that's my -- my 13 obligation is to --THE COURT: And I want you to continue to support your 14 15 obligation. I understand why you took that position. 16 least I could understand it, because there was some 17 language, and I understand that if you follow that language, 18 then you come out with your interpretation. And so, 19 therefore, there was another interpretation that I would 20 have preferred, but nevertheless, I understand that 2.1 reasonable minds can differ, and therefore, I agree with you 22 on taking your stance, because I anticipated what you would 23 say. I didn't like what it was because I was hoping for a 24 different outcome, but it didn't happen. But nevertheless,

this Court took no umbrage at what you said, and the Court

25

2.1

thoroughly respected you in your legal opinion, and you had a certain requirement to follow the law as you read it, your agency read it, and I understood what they did, and it is actually a reasonable interpretation.

It is up to another court to make a determination as to whether there can be a quote/unquote exception or whether there can be a broadening of the category as I had hoped that we could have. But if the court -- but if they decide they don't want to broaden that category to include this matter, that's certainly within the court's prerogative, but it still is a reasonable matter.

But there are some things that just aren't reasonable, and some of those people who appeared in front of me before who were talking about what their criticisms were, that was not reasonable. It is not reasonable to say that they are opposed to Mr. Henifin because he is white. That is not reasonable. That is racist. It is not reasonable for them to say that they were opposed to him because he hailed from Virginia.

That is not reasonable. We are looking for a qualified person to take over the system, and he has shown many times over that he is fully capable of doing exactly that, and we had nobody on the scene who could have done what he is doing. We didn't have anybody who could have stepped in his shoes and performed as he's performing, because these folk

2.1

don't understand anything about water. They don't understand the diseases. They don't understand how the plants work. But yet they have an opinion, which I would hope before they get up and tell me what their criticisms are, they at least understand what the real problems are. And the ones who appeared in front of me last time certainly didn't, and that was evident from the questions I asked them and the nonsensical answers that most of them gave.

So I'm not upset about that, so make sure you understand that. And as long as you practice in my court, then what I want from you is your honest opinion if I ask for it on what the law is and what the facts are, and you give me that and you and I are in good shape. And so I have no problem with that, that matter you mentioned.

But I do have a question about this mayor's letter and how it includes some criticisms that found its way into this particular notice to the public. I do have that. The mayor, it seems to me, is not a friend of this endeavor to straighten out this mess, so I hope that's wrong, and I hope that if he has been antagonistic before, I hope he recognizes that we all need to work together for the betterment of the citizenry of Jackson. And that is why you are down here, correct?

MR. FINGERHOOD: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay, then. Thank you so much, because

that's what I think Mr. Henifin has been doing all along. Now, then, good folk, thank you all very much, and there's a transcript of this matter. If any of you want to get a transcript, there's my court reporter there, and she will glady give you a copy of this transcript at a small cost to you. But she will have it prepared for you in great order. Now, then, thank you all very much. I'm adjourned. (Court adjourned at 4:58 p.m.) ******************

COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Caroline Morgan, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing pages contain a full, true, and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the forenamed case at the time and place indicated, which proceedings were stenographically reported by me to the best of my skill and ability.

I further certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and Judicial Conference of the United States.

THIS, the 18th day of October, 2024.

/s/Caroline Morgan, CCR

Caroline Morgan CCR #1957
Official Court Reporter
United States District Court
Caroline Morgan@mssd.uscourts.gov